
2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section provides an overview of the project and the environmental analysis. For additional detail regarding specific issues, please consult the appropriate chapter of Sections 4.1 through 4.12 (Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures) of the Draft EIR.

2.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will provide, to the greatest extent possible, an analysis of the potential environmental effects associated with the implementation of the Martis Valley Community Plan Update, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

This EIR analysis focuses upon potential environmental impacts arising from the project. The EIR adopts this approach in order to provide a credible worst-case scenario of the impacts resulting from project implementation.

2.2 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The proposed Martis Valley Community Plan would update the existing Placer County portion of the Martis Valley General Plan that was originally adopted in 1974. As described in Section 1 (Preface) of the Martis Valley Community Plan, the update is intended to address new environmental and socioeconomic conditions of the Martis Valley area, guide future land uses in the Plan area, as well as bring the original Martis Valley General Plan goals and policies into consistency with the 1994 Placer County General Plan.

Section 2 (Land Use) of the proposed Martis Valley Community Plan identifies the following goals associated with the general intent of the Plan:

- Goal 1.A: To promote the wise, efficient, and environmentally-sensitive use of Martis Valley lands to meet the present and future needs of Placer County residents and businesses.
- Goal 1.B: To provide adequate land in a range of residential densities to accommodate the housing needs of all income groups expected to reside in Martis Valley.
- Goal 1.C: To designate adequate commercial land for and promote development of commercial uses to meet the present and future needs of Martis Valley residents and visitors and maintain economic vitality.
- Goal 1.D: To designate adequately-sized, well-located areas for the development of public facilities to serve both community and regional needs.
- Goal 1.E: To designate land for and promote the development and expansion of public and private recreational facilities to serve the needs of residents and visitors.
- Goal 1.F: To conserve Placer County's forest resources, enhance the quality and diversity of forest ecosystems, reduce conflicts between forestry and other uses, and encourage a sustained yield of forest products.
- Goal 1.G: To preserve and enhance open space lands to maintain the natural resources of the County.

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Goal 1.H: To preserve and enhance open space for outdoor recreation purposes.

Goal 1.I: To preserve and enhance open space lands for health and safety purposes.

Goal 1.J: To preserve and enhance open space lands for resource production purposes.

Goal 1.K: To maintain a healthy and diverse local economy that meets the present and future employment, shopping, recreational, public safety, and service needs of Martis Valley residents and to expand the economic base to better serve the needs of residents.

2.3 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project and avoid and/or lessen the environmental effects of the project. This alternatives analysis provides a comparative analysis between the project and the selected alternatives. This includes a summary of the impact analysis of the Proposed Land Use Diagram (PP) and the three land use map alternatives (Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map-AA, Alternative 1 Land Use Map-AB, and Alternative 2 Land Use Map-AC). In addition to these land use map alternatives the EIR quantitatively and qualitatively evaluates the following other land use alternative, which include:

- **No Project Alternative:** CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) requires that a "no project" alternative be evaluated in an EIR. Under this alternative, the project would not be approved and the current Martis Valley General Plan (1975) policy document and land use map would remain. This analysis of the No Project Alternative is consistent with the requirements of CEQA Guidelines 15126.6(e)(3)(A), which specifically identifies that when the project under consideration is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, that the "no project" alternative will be the continuation of the existing plan.
- **Clustered Land Use Alternative:** This alternative would involve clustering land use densities as shown in Figure 6.0-1 of the Revised Draft EIR in order to provide compact development in the plan area and minimize the amount of land disturbance.
- **Reduced Intensity Alternative:** This alternative would consist of the modification of the Proposed Land Use Diagram that would minimize significant impacts identified in the analysis provided in Sections 4.1 through 4.12 of the Draft EIR (see Figure 6.0-2 of the Revised Draft EIR).
- **Lowest Intensity Alternative:** This alternative consists of reductions in development potential beyond the Alternative 2 Land Use Map (see Figure 6.0-3 of the Revised Draft EIR). Specifically, the holding capacity of the Plan Area would be reduced to 5,383 units.

2.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Placer County was identified as the lead agency for the proposed project. In accordance with Section 15082 of CEQA Guidelines, Placer County prepared and distributed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Martis Valley Community Plan Update that was circulated for public review on July 11, 2001. The NOP included a summary of probable effects on the environment

resulting from the implementation of the project. Written comments received on the NOP were considered in the preparation of the EIR. A summary of the NOP comments is included in Section 1.0 (Introduction) of the Draft EIR and the actual NOP comments are included as Appendix 1.0 of the Draft EIR.

The NOP identified that the proposed project may result in the following environmental impacts to be addressed in the EIR:

- Land Use and Planning
- Population and Housing
- Geologic Problems;
- Water;
- Air Quality;
- Transportation/Circulation;
- Geology and Soils;
- Biological Resources;
- Energy and Mineral Resources;
- Hazards;
- Noise;
- Public Services;
- Utilities and Service Systems;
- Aesthetics;
- Cultural Resources; and
- Recreation

2.5 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Table 2.0-1 displays a summary of impacts for each land use map alternative considered, Martis Valley Community Plan policies, and implementation programs and proposed mitigation measures that would avoid or minimize potential impacts. In the table, the level of significance is indicated both before and after the implementation of each mitigation measure. These impacts and mitigation measures are also applicable to the additional alternatives considered in the Revised Draft EIR.

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

For detailed discussions of all project-level mitigation measures, refer to Sections 4.1 through 4.12 of the Draft EIR and Section 6.0 of the Revised Draft EIR for the additional alternatives considered.

**TABLE 2.0-1
PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------|
| <i>Land Use</i> | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.1.1 Consistency with Relevant Land Use Planning Documents</p> <p>PP The Proposed Land Use Diagram would not potentially conflict with land use planning documents relevant to the Plan area. This is <u>would be a less than significant</u> impact.</p> <p>AA The proposed Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map Alternative would not potentially conflict with land use planning documents relevant to the Plan area. This is <u>would be a less than significant</u> impact.</p> <p>AB The proposed Alternative 1 Land Use Map would not potentially conflict with land use planning documents relevant to the Plan area. This is <u>would be a less than significant</u> impact.</p> <p>AC The proposed Alternative 2</p> | <p>Policies: 1.A.1, 1.A.2, 1.B.3, 1.B.4, 1.B.6, 1.B.7, 1.B.9, 1.B.10, 1.C.1, 1.C.3, 1.E.1, 1.F.1, 1.F.2, 1.F.3, 1.F.4, 1.F.5, 1.F.6, 1.G.1, 1.G.2, 1.G.3, 1.G.4, 1.G.5, 1.G.6, 1.G.7, 1.J.1, 5.E.1, 5.E.2</p> <p>Implementation Programs (Land Use Section):</p> <p>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6</p> | S | <p><u>None required.</u></p> <p>MM 4.1.1a All development projects shall conform to the provisions of the Tahoe Truckee Airport District Comprehensive Land Use Plan to include, but not be limited to, land use and height restrictions of the CLUP.</p> <p>MM 4.1.1b Review all development projects for consistency compliance with the goals, policies and specific requirements contained within the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Airport Master Plan for the Truckee-Tahoe Airport.</p> <p>Responsible Agency/Department: Planning Department</p> | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

**Placer County
May 2003**

**Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report**

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------|
| Land Use Map would potentially conflict with land use planning documents relevant to the Plan area. This is <u>would be a less than significant</u> impact." | | | Time frame: Ongoing Funding: Application fees | |
| Impact 4.1.2 Land Use Conflicts PP Development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in substantial change in land use in the Plan area. AA Development under the Existing Martis Valley Community Plan Land Use Map Alternative would result in substantial change in land use in the Plan area. AB Development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would result in substantial change in land use in the Plan area. AC Development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would result in substantial change in land use in the Plan area. | Policies: 1.A.5, 1.B.2, 1.B.3, 1.B.4, 1.B.5, 1.B.8, 1.C.2, 1.C.5, 1.C.6, 1.C.13, 1.C.14, 1.D.3, 1.F.3, 1.F.4, 1.F.5, 1.F.6, 1.J.1, 1.J.2 Implementation Programs (Land Use Section): 2, 3, 5 | PS | See MM 4.1.1a and b, MM 4.3.3a through c, MM 4.5.4a and b. | SU |
| Impact 4.1.3 Loss of Forest and Timber Lands PP Development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram could result in the loss of forestland. | Policies: 1.F.1, 1.F.2, 1.F.3, 1.F.4, 1.F.5, 1.F.6, 1.J.1, 9.E.3, 9.E.4, 9.E.6, 9.E.7, 9.E.8, 9.E.9, 9.E.12, 9.E.14, | S | None available. | SU |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| AA Development under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map Alternative does not change the impact to forest or timberland. AB The Alternative 1 Land Use Map would reduce the allowed development of forestland and timber resources. AC The Alternative 2 Land Use Map would allow development that could result in the loss of forestland.. | 9.E.15 | | | |
| Impact 4.1.4 Consistency with Relevant Planning Documents PP The Proposed Land Use Diagram would potentially conflict with land use planning documents relevant to the Plan area. AA The proposed Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map Alternative would potentially conflict with land use planning documents relevant to the Plan area. AB The proposed Alternative 1 Land Use Map would potentially conflict with land use planning documents relevant to the Plan area. | Policies: 1.A.1, 1.A.2, 1.B.3, 1.B.4, 1.B.6, 1.B.7, 1.B.9, 1.B.10, 1.C.1, 1.C.3, 1.E.1, 1.F.1, 1.F.2, 1.F.3, 1.F.4, 1.F.5, 1.F.6, 1.G.1, 1.G.2, 1.G.3, 1.G.4, 1.G.5, 1.G.6, 1.G.7, 1.J.1, 5.E.1, 5.E.2 Implementation Programs (Land Use Section): 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| AC The proposed Alternative 2 Land Use Map would potentially conflict with land use planning documents relevant to the Plan area. | | | | |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|--|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Impact 4.1.5 Cumulative Land Use Conflicts PP Development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in substantial change in land use in the Plan area. This is a cumulative significant impact. AA Development under the Existing Martis Valley Community Plan Land Use Map Alternative would result in substantial change in land use in the Plan area. This is a cumulative significant impact. AB Development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would result in substantial change in land use in the Plan area. This is a cumulative significant impact. AC Development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would result in substantial change in land use in the Plan area. This is a cumulative significant impact. | Policies: 1.A.5, 1.B.2, 1.B.3, 1.B.4, 1.B.5, 1.B.8, 1.C.2, 1.C.5, 1.C.6, 1.C.13, 1.C.14, 1.D.3, 1.F.3, 1.F.4, 1.F.5, 1.F.6, 1.J.1, 1.J.2 Implementation Programs (Land Use Section): 2, 3, 5 | CS | None available. | SU |
| Impact 4.1.6 Cumulative Loss of Timber/Forest Resources PP Development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the loss of forestland. AA Development under the Existing Martis | Policies: 1.F.1, 1.F.2, 1.F.3, 1.F.4, 1.F.5, 1.F.6, 1.J.1, 9.E.3, 9.E.4, 9.E.6, 9.E.7, 9.E.8, 9.E.9, 9.E.12, 9.E.14, 9.E.15 | CS | None available. | SU |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>Valley General Plan Land Use Map Alternative would result in the loss of forestland.</p> <p>AB The Alternative 1 Land Use Map would result in the loss of forestland.</p> <p>AC The Alternative 2 Land Use Map would result in the loss of forestland.</p> | | | | |
| Population/Housing/Employment | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.2.1 Holding Capacity</p> <p>PP Development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram could potentially exceed the holding capacity of Martis Valley.</p> <p>AA Development under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map could potentially exceed the holding capacity of Martis Valley.</p> <p>AB Development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map could potentially exceed the holding capacity of Martis Valley.</p> <p>AC Development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map could potentially exceed the holding capacity of Martis Valley.</p> | None required | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| Impact 4.2.2 Housing PP Development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in housing impacts through not providing sufficient affordable housing and creating an imbalance between employment and housing. AA Development under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would result in housing impacts through not providing sufficient affordable housing and creating an imbalance between employment and housing. AB Development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would result in housing impacts through not providing sufficient affordable housing and creating an imbalance between employment and housing. AC Development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would result in housing impacts through not providing sufficient affordable housing and creating an imbalance between employment and housing. | Policies: 3.A.1, 3.A.2, 3.A.3, 3.A.4, 3.A.5, 3.A.6, 3.A.7, 3.A.8 Implementation Programs (Population and Housing Section): 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 11 | LSPS | MM 4.2.2 As a condition of approval of each housing development in Martis Valley, the project applicant shall construct 5 percent of units affordable to very low income households (0 to 50 percent of area median income) and 5 percent of units affordable to low income households (50 to 80 percent of median income). Where practicable, the County shall require the future developer of each project site to construct affordable housing as early as possible. In instances where the County finds that it is not feasible to construct the affordable units, the developer shall be required to pay a fee as described in Policy 3.A.3. Responsible Agency/ Department: Planning Department Time frame: Ongoing Funding: General Fund | LS |

S - Significant
 PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
 CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
 B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| Impact 4.2.3 Cumulative Housing Impact PP Cumulative development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram could potentially exceed the holding capacity of Martis Valley as well as result in housing impacts. AA Cumulative development under the No Project Alternative could potentially exceed the holding capacity of Martis Valley as well as result in housing impacts. AB Cumulative development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map could potentially exceed the holding capacity of Martis Valley as well as result in housing impacts. AC Cumulative development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map could potentially exceed the holding capacity of Martis Valley as well as result in housing impacts. | Policies: 3.A.1, 3.A.2, 3.A.3, 3.A.4, 3.A.5, 3.A.6, 3.A.7, 3.A.8 Implementation Programs (Population and Housing Section): 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 11 | LSGS | Implement Mitigation Measure MM 4.2.2. | LS |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------|
| Human Health/Risk of Upset | | | | |
| Impact 4.3.1 Abandoned Mines and Tailings PP The potential exists for abandoned mine shafts and openings in the Plan area to present a physical hazard for subsequent development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram. AA The potential exists for abandoned mine shafts and openings in the Plan area to present a physical hazard for subsequent development under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map. AB The potential exists for abandoned mine shafts and openings in the Plan area to present a physical hazard for subsequent development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map. AC The potential exists for abandoned mine shafts and openings in the Plan area to present a physical hazard for subsequent development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map. | Policy: 9.A.1 Implementation Program (Natural Resources Section): 2 | PS | MM 4.3.1 Upon the identification of mine facilities on a project site within the Plan area, the County shall require that a detailed survey of the mine features and a hazards assessment be performed and that remedial measures be undertaken in areas of waste rock, mine tailings, and other associated contamination areas. Remediation shall be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the County, California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Remedial measures that could be implemented include, but are not limited to, the following: 1) fencing the impacted area to prohibit public access, 2) removal of mine wastes to an appropriate landfill facility, 3) consolidate and | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| | | | encapsulate mine wastes, restore the area with vegetation, and re-route drainage, and 4) securing mine sites to restrict access and subsidence. | |
| Impact 4.3.2 Hazardous Materials Contamination PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram could result in potential disturbance and contamination of existing and future land uses resulting from the use of toxic chemicals, the storage and disposal of toxic chemicals, and other hazardous materials. AA Implementation of Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map could result in potential disturbance and contamination of existing and future land uses resulting from the use of toxic chemicals, the storage and disposal of toxic chemicals, and other hazardous materials. AB Implementation of Alternative 1 Land Use Map could result in potential disturbance and contamination of existing and future land uses resulting | None required | PS | MM 4.3.2 Prior to site improvements for properties that are suspected or known to contain hazardous materials and sites that are listed in the hazardous material/waste database search or the California State Water Resources Control Board database, the County shall require that the soil and surrounding area shall be tested and remediated for potential hazardous materials in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations. | LS |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| <p>from the use of toxic chemicals, the storage and disposal of toxic chemicals, and other hazardous materials.</p> <p>AC Implementation of Alternative 2 Land Use Map could result in potential disturbance and contamination of existing and future land uses resulting from the use of toxic chemicals, the storage and disposal of toxic chemicals, and other hazardous materials.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.3.3 Airport Operations</p> <p>PP The potential exists for safety hazards associated with airport operations to occur within the Plan area in areas proposed for development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram.</p> <p>AA The potential exists for safety hazards associated with airport operations to occur within the Plan area in areas proposed for development under the existing Martis Valley Community Plan Land Use Map.</p> <p>AB The potential exists for safety hazards associated with airport operations to occur within the Plan area in areas proposed for development under the</p> | <p>Policies: 5.E.1, 5.E.2</p> | <p>PS</p> | <p>MM 4.3.3a The County shall review all development projects in the overflight zones of the Truckee-Tahoe Airport for consistency with its Comprehensive Land Use Plan.</p> <p>MM 4.3.3b The County shall limit land uses in airport safety zones to those uses listed in the applicable airport comprehensive land use plans (CLUPs) as compatible uses. Exceptions shall be made only as provided for in the CLUPs or State law. Such uses shall also be regulated to ensure compatibility in</p> | <p>LS</p> |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| <p>Alternative 1 Land Use Map.</p> <p>AC The potential exists for safety hazards associated with airport operations to occur within the Plan area in areas proposed for development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map.</p> | | | <p>terms of location, height, and noise.</p> <p>MM 4.3.3c The County shall ensure that development within the airport approach and departure zones complies with Part 77 of the Federal Aviation Administration Regulations (objects affecting navigable airspace).</p> | |
| <p>Impact 4.3.4 Radon Exposure</p> <p>PP Development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram could be potentially exposed to radon.</p> <p>AA Development under the existing Martis Valley Community Plan Land Use Map could be potentially exposed to radon.</p> <p>AB Development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map could be potentially exposed to radon.</p> <p>AC Development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map could be potentially exposed to radon.</p> | None required | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| Impact 4.3.5 Cumulative Hazard Impacts PP Development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram could result in site-specific hazards for area residents. AA Development under the existing Martis Valley Community Plan Land Use Map could result in site-specific hazards for area residents. AB Development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map could result in site-specific hazards for area residents. AC Development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map could result in site-specific hazards for area residents. | Policies: 9.A.1, 5.E.1, 5.E.2 Implementation Program (Natural Resources Section): 2 | LS | None required. | LS |
| Transportation and Circulation | | | | |
| Impact 4.4.1 Potential to Exceed an Established Level of Service Standard PP Depending upon the roadway network and analysis period, intersection and roadway Level of Service (LOS) standards are forecast to be exceeded under full development of the Proposed Land Use Diagram for <u>roadways and up to 8 intersections in the Town of Truckee, and 3 intersections and 2 roadway</u> | Policies: 5.A.3, 5.A.4, 5.A.7, 5.A.8, 5.A.9, 5.A.10, 5.A.11, 5.A.12, 5.A.13, 5.A.14, 5.A.15, 5.C.1, 5.C.2, 5.C.3, 5.C.4 Implementation | S | MM 4.4.1a The County shall establish a capital improvement program for the land use map and roadway improvements ultimately approved by the County for the improvements identified in Tables 4.4-20 through 4.4-25 (depending on the land use map adopted). This would | SU |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| <p>segments and in Placer County.</p> <p>AA Depending upon the roadway network and analysis period, intersection and roadway Level of Service (LOS) standards are forecast to be exceeded under full development of this land use alternative for <u>roadways and up to 8 intersections in the Town of Truckee, and 3 intersections and 1 roadway segment</u> in Placer County.</p> <p>AB Depending upon the roadway network and analysis period, intersection and roadway Level of Service (LOS) standards are forecast to be exceeded under full development of this land use alternative for <u>roadways and up to 8 intersections in the Town of Truckee, and 3 intersections and 1 roadway segment</u> in Placer County.</p> <p>AC Depending upon the roadway network and analysis period, intersection and roadway Level of Service (LOS) standards are forecast to be exceeded under full development of this land use alternative for <u>roadways and up to 8 intersections in the Town of Truckee, and 3 intersections and 1 roadway segment</u> in Placer County.</p> | <p>Programs (Transportation and Circulation Section): 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9</p> | | <p>adopted). This would include funding and coordination for traffic improvements associated with impacts identified in the Town of Truckee as well as to state highway facilities (SR 267 and SR 28).</p> <p><u>The County will establish a capital improvement program for the land use and roadway improvements identified in Tables 4.4-20 through 4.4-25 (depending on the land use map adopted) for impacts identified within Placer County's jurisdiction.</u></p> <p><u>The County shall develop a mechanism whereby development within the plan area pays its fair share contributions toward transportation improvements outside of the County's jurisdiction as identified in this environmental document or as defined in project specific environmental impact</u></p> | |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|-------------------|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| in Placer County. | | | <p>reports.</p> <p>The County shall complete a focused transit service plan for the Martis Valley area. This plan shall identify an appropriate and reasonable public transit program to accommodate future growth. The transit service plan shall develop a funding mechanism (potentially a CSA) and shall be the basis of developing agreements that provide for input from and coordination with the CSA, Placer County, Town of Truckee, and development stakeholders to ensure coordinated service and connections with adequate capacity and year-round service provisions. This plan shall be conducted after the completion of the Tahoe Area Regional Transit Short Range Transit Plan currently (May, 2003) being conducted by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and shall be consistent with</p> | |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| | | | <p><u>this plan.</u></p> <p>MM 4.4.1b (optional) Reduce Land Use Quantities in Martis Valley Community Plan Area.</p> | |
| <p>Impact 4.4.2 Traffic Impacts to Local Residential Roadways</p> <p>PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in an increase in traffic volumes along local residential roadways in the Sierra Meadows/Ponderosa Palisades area if the Palisades connection is made.</p> <p>AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would result in an increase in traffic volumes along local residential roadways in the Sierra Meadows/Ponderosa Palisades area if the Palisades connection is made.</p> <p>AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would result in an increase in traffic volumes along local residential roadways in the Sierra Meadows/Ponderosa Palisades area if the Palisades connection is made.</p> | Policy: 5.A.5 | PS | <p>MM 4.4.2a The Circulation Diagram shall not allow public roadway access to the Sierra Meadows/Ponderosa Palisades area.</p> <p>MM 4.4.2b The Northstar Connector (if ultimately included as part of the Circulation Diagram as a public roadway) shall be designed to accommodate projected traffic volumes with minimal local residential roadway connections. Residential lots shall be restricted from having direct access onto the Connector.</p> | LS |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| AC Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in an increase in traffic volumes along local residential roadways in the Sierra Meadows/ Ponderosa Palisades area if the Palisades connection is made. | | | | |
| Impact 4.4.3 Potential Hazards Because of Design or Incompatible Uses | Policies: 5.A.2, 5.A.4 | LS | None required. | LS |
| PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram is not expected to result in significant traffic hazards. | | | | |
| AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map is not expected to result in significant traffic hazards. | | | | |
| AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map is not expected to result in significant traffic hazards. | | | | |
| AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map is not expected to result in significant traffic hazards. | | | | |
| Impact 4.4.4 Inadequate Parking Capacity | Policy: 5.A.6 | LS | None required. | LS |
| PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram is not expected to result in parking capacity impacts. | | | | |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|--|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map is not expected to result in parking capacity impacts. AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map is not expected to result in parking capacity impacts. AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map is not expected to result in parking capacity impacts. | | | | |
| Impact 4.4.5 Conflicts with Transit PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram is not expected to result in conflicts with transit. AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map is not expected to result in conflicts with transit. AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map is not expected to result in conflicts with transit. AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map is not expected to result | Policies: 5.B.1, 5.B.2, 5.B.3, 5.B.4, 5.B.5, 5.B.6, 5.B.7, 5.C.1, 5.D.2 Implementation Programs (Transportation and Circulation Section): 1, 7, 8 | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| in conflicts with transit. | | | | |
| Impact 4.4.6 Conflicts with Pedestrian and Bicycle Uses PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram is not expected to result in conflicts with pedestrian and bicycle uses. AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map is not expected to result in conflicts with pedestrian and bicycle uses. AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map is not expected to result in conflicts with pedestrian and bicycle uses. AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map is not expected to result in conflicts with pedestrian and bicycle uses. | Policies: 5.A.3, 5.C.1, 5.C.2, 5.D.1, 5.D.2, 5.D.3, 5.D.4, 5.D.5 Implementation Programs (Transportation and Circulation Section): 1, 3, 4, 9 | LS | None required. | LS |
| Impact 4.4.7 Cumulative Impacts to Area Intersections and Roadways PP Depending upon the roadway network and analysis period, intersection and roadway Level of Service (LOS) standards are forecast to be exceeded | Policies: 5.A.3, 5.A.4, 5.A.7, 5.A.8, 5.A.9, 5.A.10, 5.A.11, 5.A.12, 5.A.13, 5.A.14, 5.A.15, 5.C.1, 5.C.2, | CS | See MM 4.4.1a and/or b and MM 4.4.2a and b. | SU |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|--|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>under full development of the Proposed Land Use Diagram and other regional development under year 2021 conditions for area roadway facilities in the Town of Truckee and Placer County.</p> <p>AA Depending upon the roadway network and analysis period, intersection and roadway Level of Service (LOS) standards are forecast to be exceeded under full development of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map and other regional development under year 2021 conditions for area roadway facilities in the Town of Truckee and Placer County.</p> <p>AB Depending upon the roadway network and analysis period, intersection and roadway Level of Service (LOS) standards are forecast to be exceeded under full development of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map and other regional development under year 2021 conditions for area roadway facilities in the Town of Truckee and Placer County.</p> <p>AC Depending upon the roadway network and analysis period, intersection and roadway Level of Service (LOS) standards are forecast to be exceeded</p> | <p>5.C.3, 5.C.4,</p> <p>Implementation Programs (Transportation and Circulation Section):</p> <p>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9</p> | | | |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| under full development of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map and other regional development under year 2021 conditions for area roadway facilities in the Town of Truckee and Placer County. | | | | |
| Impact 4.4.8 Cumulative Impacts to Regional Highway Facilities PP Full development of the Proposed Land Use Diagram and other regional development is expected to add to year 2021 traffic volumes along Interstate 80 and State Route 89 (north of Interstate 80). While State Route 89 (north of Interstate 80) is anticipated to operate properly, Interstate 80 is expected to operate deficiently. AA Full development of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map and other regional development is expected to add to year 2021 traffic volumes along Interstate 80 and State Route 89 (north of Interstate 80). While State Route 89 (north of Interstate 80) is anticipated to operate properly, Interstate 80 is expected to operate deficiently. AB Full development of the Alternative 1 | None required | CS | None available | SU |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>Land Use Map and other regional development is expected to add to year 2021 traffic volumes along Interstate 80 and State Route 89 (north of Interstate 80). While State Route 89 (north of Interstate 80) is anticipated to operate properly, Interstate 80 is expected to operate deficiently.</p> <p>AC Full development of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map and other regional development is expected to add to year 2021 traffic volumes along Interstate 80 and State Route 89 (north of Interstate 80). While State Route 89 (north of Interstate 80) is anticipated to operate properly, Interstate 80 is expected to operate deficiently.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.4.9 Cumulative Roadway Hazards Because of Design or Incompatible Uses</p> <p>PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram is not expected to contribute to significant traffic hazards.</p> <p>AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map is not expected to contribute to significant traffic hazards.</p> | Policies: 5.A.2 and 5.A.4 | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|--|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map is not expected to contribute to significant traffic hazards. AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map is not expected to contribute to significant traffic hazards. | | | | |
| Impact 4.4.10 Cumulative Conflicts with Transit, Pedestrian and Bicycle Uses PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram is not expected to contribute to conflicts with transit. AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map is not expected to contribute to conflicts with transit, pedestrian and bicycle uses. AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map is not expected to contribute to conflicts with transit, pedestrian and bicycle uses. AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map is not expected to contribute to conflicts with transit, pedestrian and bicycle uses. | Policies: 5.A.3, 5.B.1, 5.B.2, 5.B.3, 5.B.4, 5.B.5, 5.B.6, 5.B.7, 5.C.1, 5.C.2, 5.D.1, 5.D.2, 5.D.3, 5.D.4, 5.D.5, 5.D.6, 5.D.7 Implementation Programs (Transportation and Circulation Section): 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9 | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| Noise | | | | |
| Impact 4.5.1 Construction Noise Impacts PP Noise associated with construction activities for subsequent development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in elevated noise levels that would be in excess of applicable noise standards. AA Noise associated with construction activities for subsequent development under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would result in elevated noise levels that would be in excess of applicable noise standards. AB Noise associated with construction activities for subsequent development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would result in elevated noise levels that would be in excess of applicable noise standards. AC Noise associated with construction activities for subsequent development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would result in elevated noise levels that would be in excess of applicable noise standards. | None available | S | MM 4.5.1a As part of subsequent project approvals, the County shall require that construction activities be prohibited on Sundays and federal holidays and limited to daytime hours (6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays). MM 4.5.1b As part of subsequent project approvals, the County shall require that stationary construction equipment and construction staging areas be setback from existing noise-sensitive land uses. The setback distance will be considered on a case-by-case basis and will be determined by the County as part of subsequent project review. | SU |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Impact 4.5.2 Transportation Noise Impacts PP Anticipated transportation noise increases associated with subsequent development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in elevated noise levels that would be in excess of applicable noise standards. AA Anticipated transportation noise increases associated with subsequent development under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would result in elevated noise levels that would be in excess of applicable noise standards. AB Anticipated transportation noise increases associated with subsequent development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would result in elevated noise levels that would be in excess of applicable noise standards. AC Anticipated transportation noise increases associated with subsequent development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would result in elevated noise levels that would be in excess of applicable noise standards. | Policies: 10.A.3, 10.A.5, 10.A.6, 10.A.7, 10.A.8, 10.A.10 Implementation Programs (Noise Section): 1 and 2 | S | None available. | SU |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Impact 4.5.3 Future Stationary Noise Impacts PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram could result in the future development of land uses that generate noise levels in excess of applicable noise standards for non-transportation noise sources. AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map could result in the future development of land uses that generate noise levels in excess of applicable noise standards for non-transportation noise sources. AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map could result in the future development of land uses that generate noise levels in excess of applicable noise standards for non-transportation noise sources. AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map could result in the future development of land uses that generate noise levels in excess of applicable noise standards for non-transportation noise sources. | Policies: 10.A.1, 10.A.2, 10.A.3, 10.A.4, 10.A.9, 10.A.10 Implementation Programs (Noise Section): 1 and 2 | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| Impact 4.5.4 Truckee-Tahoe Airport Noise Impacts PP Subsequent development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram would be exposed to noise associated with the operation of the Truckee-Tahoe Airport. AA Subsequent development under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would be exposed to noise associated with the operation of the Truckee-Tahoe Airport. AB Subsequent development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would be exposed to noise associated with the operation of the Truckee-Tahoe Airport. AC Subsequent development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would be exposed to noise associated with the operation of the Truckee-Tahoe Airport. | Policies: 10.A.3, 10.A.5, 10.A.6, 10.A.7, 10.A.8, 10.A.10 Implementation Programs (Noise Section): 1 and 2 | S | MM 4.5.4a As part of subsequent residential project approvals, the County shall require that aviation easements be granted to the Truckee-Tahoe Airport District as appropriate. The purpose of the easement is to disclose to future residents that they may be exposed to occasional noise from aircraft utilizing the airport. MM 4.5.4b As part of subsequent residential project submittals for land areas within the designated 55 CNEL contour of the Truckee Tahoe Airport, the County shall require that the applicant incorporate mitigation that is sufficient to bring interior noise levels to 45 CNEL. | SU |
| Impact 4.5.5 Cumulative Traffic Noise Impacts PP Anticipated transportation noise increases associated with subsequent development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram in year 2021 would | None available. | CS | None available. | SU |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>contribute to elevated noise levels that would be in excess of applicable noise standards.</p> <p>AA Anticipated transportation noise increases associated with subsequent development under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map in year 2021 would contribute to elevated noise levels that would be in excess of applicable noise standards.</p> <p>AB Anticipated transportation noise increases associated with subsequent development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map in year 2021 would contribute to elevated noise levels that would be in excess of applicable noise standards.</p> <p>AC Anticipated transportation noise increases associated with subsequent development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map in year 2021 would contribute to elevated noise levels that would be in excess of applicable noise standards.</p> | | | | |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------|
| Air Quality | | | | |
| Impact 4.6.1 Construction Air Quality Impacts PP The potential exists for construction emissions to exceed the PCAPCD's significance thresholds for air pollutants for subsequent development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram. AA The potential exists for construction emissions to exceed the PCAPCD's significance thresholds for air pollutants for subsequent development under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan. AB The potential exists for construction emissions to exceed the PCAPCD's significance thresholds for air pollutants for subsequent development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map. AC The potential exists for construction emissions to exceed the PCAPCD's significance thresholds for air pollutants for subsequent development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map. | Policy: 9.H.1, 9.H.2, 9.H.5, 9.H.6, 9.H.7, 9.H.8 | S | The following mitigation measure shall be added as an implementation program in Section IX of the Natural Resources Section of the Community Plan: MM 4.6.1 The County shall require subsequent projects to fully mitigate their construction air pollutant emissions that are in excess of Placer County Air Pollution Control District's thresholds of significance for emissions. This may include the use of low emission construction equipment, particulate matter control measures, and/or participation in Placer County's Air Pollution Control District's offsite mitigation program. Responsible Agency/Department: Planning Department Time Frame: On-going Funding: Application Fees | SU |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| Impact 4.6.2 Local Carbon Monoxide Concentration Impacts PP Carbon monoxide concentrations (hot spots) at project intersections at build-out under the Proposed Land Use Diagram would not exceed state or federal air quality standards. AA Carbon monoxide concentrations (hot spots) at project intersections at build-out under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan would not exceed state or federal air quality standards. AB Carbon monoxide concentrations (hot spots) at project intersections at build-out under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would not exceed state or federal air quality standards. AC Carbon monoxide concentrations (hot spots) at project intersections at build-out under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would not exceed state or federal air quality standards. | None required | LS | None required. | LS |
| Impact 4.6.3 Regional Ozone Precursor Emissions PP Summertime emissions of ozone precursors as a result of subsequent | Policies: 9.H.1, 9.H.4, 9.H.5, 9.H.6, 9.H.8, 9.H.9, 9.H.10, 9.H.11, 9.H.12, | S | MM 4.6.3 "County staff will develop, with the advice of the Placer County APCD, a mitigation fee program for indirect sources similar to that in use | SU |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| <p>development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram would exceed the Placer County APCD's thresholds of significance.</p> <p>AA Summertime emissions of ozone precursors as a result of subsequent development under this alternative would exceed the Placer County APCD's thresholds of significance.</p> <p>AB Summertime emissions of ozone precursors as a result of subsequent development under this alternative would exceed the Placer County APCD's thresholds of significance.</p> <p>AC Summertime emissions of ozone precursors as a result of subsequent development under this alternative would exceed the Placer County APCD's thresholds of significance.</p> | 9.H.13, 9.H.14 | | <p>in western Placer County. Mitigation targets will be identified, appropriate off-site mitigation programs developed, and equitable fees established. The County (in coordination with the Placer County APCD) shall develop an offsite mitigation program to offset the development increases in Nitrogen Oxide, Reactive Organic Gas and Particulate Matter emissions. This may include development of a fee program that could fund activities such as retrofitting existing heavy equipment/vehicles with cleaner burning engines, retrofitting or purchasing new low emission transit vehicles and equipment, providing natural gas fuel infrastructure, implement improved street sweeping and sanding guidelines/procedures, provision of a green waste pick up program as an alternative to burning and</p> | |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| | | | <p><u>replacing non-EPA certified woodstoves with new EPA certified units.</u></p> <p><u>The County shall promote and encourage new development to utilize non-wood burning devices in the Plan area. Only EPA certified Phase II wood burning devices or their equivalent shall be allowed within the Plan area. The maximum emission potential from each residence shall not exceed 7.5 grams per hour. Outdoor burn pits must be plumbed with natural gas and prohibited from burning wood."</u></p> | |
| Impact 4.6.4 Regional PM₁₀ Emissions PP Project-related emissions of PM ₁₀ for the Proposed Land Use Diagram would exceed the Placer County APCD's thresholds of significance. AA Project-related emissions of PM ₁₀ for the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would exceed the Placer | Policies: 9.H.1, 9.H.4, 9.H.5, 9.H.6, 9.H.8 | S | Implement Mitigation Measure MM 4.6.3. | SU |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| <p>County APCD's thresholds of significance.</p> <p>AB Project-related emissions of PM₁₀ for the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would exceed the Placer County APCD's thresholds of significance.</p> <p>AC Project-related emissions of PM₁₀ for the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would exceed the Placer County APCD's thresholds of significance.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.6.5 Cumulative Air Quality Impacts</p> <p>PP Anticipated development and operational effects associated with subsequent development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram in would contribute local and regional air pollution emissions.</p> <p>AA Anticipated development and operational effects associated with subsequent development under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would contribute local and regional air pollution emissions.</p> <p>AB Anticipated development and operational effects associated with subsequent development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map in would</p> | <p>Policies: 9.H.1, 9.H.4, 9.H.5, 9.H.6, 9.H.8, 9.H.9, 9.H.10, 9.H.11, 9.H.12, 9.H.13, 9.H.14</p> | CS | Implement Mitigation Measures MM 4.6.1 and 4.6.2. | SU |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------|
| <p>contribute local and regional air pollution emissions.</p> <p>AC Anticipated development and operational effects associated with subsequent development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map is would contribute local and regional air pollution emissions.</p> | | | | |
| Hydrology and Water Quality | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.7.1 Construction Water Quality Impacts</p> <p>PP Construction activities associated with subsequent development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram could cause accelerated soil erosion and sedimentation or the release of other pollutants to adjacent waterways.</p> <p>AA Construction activities associated with subsequent development under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map could cause accelerated soil erosion and sedimentation or the release of other pollutants to adjacent waterways.</p> <p>AB Construction activities associated with subsequent development under the</p> | <p>Policies: 6.E.3, 6.E.10, 6.E.11, 9.D.1, 9.D.2, 9.D.3, 9.D.4, 9.D.5, 9.D.7, 9.D.8, 9.D.9, 9.D.10, 9.F.2, 9.F.5</p> <p>Implementation Programs (Natural Resources Section): 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 15, 18</p> | S | <p>MM 4.7.1a The County shall require that each subsequent project applicant shall prepare a spill prevention and countermeasure plan describing measures to ensure proper collection and disposal of all pollutants handled or produced on the site during construction, including sanitary wastes, cement, and petroleum products. The plan shall be incorporated into project improvement plans.</p> <p>MM 4.7.1b The County shall require each subsequent project clearly identify specific water</p> | LS |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| <p>Alternative 1 Land Use Map could cause accelerated soil erosion and sedimentation or the release of other pollutants to adjacent waterways.</p> <p>AC Construction activities associated with subsequent development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map could cause accelerated soil erosion and sedimentation or the release of other pollutants to adjacent waterways.</p> | | | <p>quality control measures for Plan area waterways during construction activities. Water quality control features <u>and required on-going monitoring and reporting to the County and Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board as part of compliance with this measure</u> shall demonstrate that the water quality controls will ensure no increase in <u>predevelopment</u> sediment or other pollutant loads <u>conditions</u> in <u>natural</u> waterways and that storm water discharges are in compliance with all current requirements of the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (e.g., Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region).</p> <p>MM 4.7.1c Subsequent development activities in the Plan area shall avoid disturbing <u>to the extent feasible</u> or altering existing wetlands, natural waterway courses or channel conditions. Exceptions to this</p> | |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| | | | policy would include minor stream crossings and improvements to the waterway that enhance the waterways natural condition to convey water and improve water quality. Exceptions will be considered on a case-by-case basis by the County and the RWQCB and must be in compliance with the Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region (Basin Plan). | |
| Impact 4.7.2 Operational Surface Water Quality Impacts PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram could result in direct and indirect surface water quality impacts from operation of various land uses in the Plan area. AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map could result in direct and indirect surface water quality impacts from operation of various land uses in the Plan area. | Policies: 6.E.6, 6.E.8, 6.E.10, 6.E.11, 9.D.1, 9.D.4, 9.D.5, 9.D.9, 9.D.10, 9.F.1, 9.F.2, 9.F.5 Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services and Natural Resources Sections): 1, 15, 16, 17, 18 | S | MM 4.7.2a The County shall require that each subsequent project develop a surface water quality control program to be incorporated into the project's storm water drainage system design. This program would specify the design of planned water quality facilities to be used in the project's drainage system, including details and methods for intercepting and improving surface water quality as well as maintenance of facilities. | LS |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| <p>AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map could result in direct and indirect surface water quality impacts from operation of various land uses in the Plan area.</p> <p>AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map could result in direct and indirect surface water quality impacts from operation of various land uses in the Plan area.</p> | | | <p><u>correcting deficiencies with water quality control features and monitoring and reporting to the County and Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board. Water quality control features (including water quality control features for golf courses [Mitigation Measure MM 4.7.2c]) shall demonstrate that the water quality controls will ensure no increase in predevelopment sediment or other pollutant loads conditions in natural waterways and that storm water discharges are in compliance with all current requirements of the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board.</u></p> <p>MM 4.7.2b In addition to the setback requirements set forth in Policy 9.D.1, subsequent projects will be conditioned to prohibit application of fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides within natural waterway courses and</p> | |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| | | | <p>wetlands. Exact buffer distances from waterways and wetlands for chemical application shall be determined on a case-by-case basis based on technical analysis of the project and in consultation with the County and the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board.</p> <p>MM 4.7.2c The County will require that future golf courses be designed to reduce the threat to surrounding waterways and wetland areas. Specifically by minimizing total acreage of managed turf, the need for fertilizers and chemicals would be minimized and the size of natural areas would be maximized. Natural areas would promote wildlife habitat and provide buffers to the environment from higher trafficked areas. Landscaped areas shall be restricted to only greens, tees, and fairways. The golf</p> | |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| | | | <p>courses shall be designed to retain natural surface drainage patterns with buffer areas and will control and divert runoff away from greens, tee, fairways and other managed turf areas to prevent leaching and erosion of chemicals applied in these areas.</p> <p>The County shall also require proper chemical management (i.e., Chemical Application Management Plans [CHAMP]) for the operation of new golf courses. New golf courses shall utilize appropriate chemical management objectives via direct application of procedures that ensure water quality objectives are met as defined by the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board and California Inland Surface Waters Plan the State Water Resources Control Board Policy for Toxic Standards for Inland Surface</p> | |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| | | | <p><u>Waters, Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California.</u> Specific water quality objectives for new golf courses shall ensure the biostimulatory substances, floating materials, oil and grease, pesticides and sediment shall not be in sufficient concentrations to cause a nuisance, adversely affect the beneficial uses of on-site surface waters, runoff or groundwater or exceed water quality criteria set forth in the Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region (Basin Plan). Water quality objectives for nine types of element/compounds is set by the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board and are presented in the Basin Plan.</p> <p>The CHAMP or similar management plan shall incorporate the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A description of golf course design features that prevent direct | |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| | | | <p>discharges of surface runoff into stream channels and groundwater.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A description of chemicals authorized for use and approved within the State of California, along with guidelines for their application. Guidelines shall include restrictions on their use near drainage systems. Chemicals include fertilizers, herbicides, fungicides, insecticides and rodenticides. ▪ Guidelines on the application of fertilizers and soil amendments that take into consideration the physical characteristics and nutrient content of the soil on the golf course site. ▪ Guidelines for the irrigation of the golf course that take into consideration the field capacity of soil types and the timing with chemical applications. ▪ A water quality monitoring program that includes sampling would be timed with the application of soil amendments or on a regularly scheduled basis. This monitoring program shall also be implemented | |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| | | | <p>with consideration of the RWQCB water quality objectives for the Martis Creek at its confluence the Truckee River.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chemical storage requirements and chemical spill response and chemical inventory response plans would be prepared and implemented. Pesticide concentrations shall not be allowed to accumulate in bottom sediments or aquatic life, nor can chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides be found at detectable concentrations in surface waters. Maximum Concentration Levels (MCL), per the Water Quality Goals for California Inland Surface Water for Human Health and Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection shall be met for waters in golf course lakes and other surface water bodies including streams and springs. Also, groundwaters shall not contain any chemical contaminants derived from operations in excess of the MCLs specified for domestic drinking water supplies in the CCR, Title 22, Division 4, Chapter 15 for | |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------|
| | | | <p>the turf management chemical compounds including, but not limited to, 2,4-D, Atazine, Bentazon, Carbofuran, Glyphosate and Simazine."</p> <p>MM 4.7.2d The County shall require that subsequent development projects provide open fencing and signage restricting area residents from intruding in wetlands and providing information regarding the sensitivity of these resources to include requirements for domestic pet control.</p> <p>MM 4.7.2e The County shall require that snow storage areas shall be located outside of areas that drain directly into waterways, except where storm drainage and treatment facilities are provided.</p> | |
| Impact 4.7.3 Groundwater Quality Impacts PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram could result in the degradation of groundwater quality | Policies: 6.C.6, 6.D.1, 6.D.5, 6.D.6, 6.D.7, 9.D.1, 9.D.4, 9.D.5, 9.D.9, | PS | MM 4.7.3 Future land uses that are anticipated to utilize hazardous materials or waste shall be required to provide adequate containment | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------|
| <p>resulting from future land uses.</p> <p>AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map could result in the degradation of groundwater quality resulting from future land uses.</p> <p>AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map could result in the degradation of groundwater quality resulting from future land uses.</p> <p>AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map could result in the degradation of groundwater quality resulting from future land uses.</p> | <p>9.D.10, 9.F.1, 9.F.2, 9.F.5</p> <p>Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services and Natural Resources Sections); 1, 8, 12, 13,14, 15, 16, 17, 18</p> | | <p>facilities to ensure that surface water and groundwater resources are protected from accidental releases. This shall include double-containment, levees to contain spills, and monitoring wells for underground storage tanks, as required by local, state and federal standards.</p> | |
| <p>Impact 4.7.4 Groundwater Recharge Areas Impacts</p> <p>PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the increase of impervious surfaces in the Plan area. However, this increase in impervious surfaces is not expected to substantially impact groundwater recharge.</p> <p>AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would result in the increase of</p> | <p>Policies: 6.D.6, 9.D.9, 9.D.10</p> <p>Implementation Program (Natural Resources Section): 12</p> | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| <p>impervious surfaces in the Plan area. However, this increase in impervious surfaces is not expected to substantially impact groundwater recharge.</p> <p>AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would result in the increase of impervious surfaces in the Plan area. However, this increase in impervious surfaces is not expected to substantially impact groundwater recharge.</p> <p>AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would result in the increase of impervious surfaces in the Plan area. However, this increase in impervious surfaces is not expected to substantially impact groundwater recharge.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.7.5 Increased Groundwater Usage Impacts</p> <p>PP Implementation of land uses under the Proposed Land Use Diagram would increase groundwater usage in Martis Valley, which could adversely impact groundwater resources as well as interactions between groundwater and surface water.</p> | <p>Policies: 6.C.1, 6.C.4</p> <p>Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services and Natural Resources Sections): 6, 8,</p> | PS | <p>MM 4.7.5 The County, in coordination with the Placer County Water Agency and the Northstar Community Services District, shall require that proponents of new development demonstrate that new well facilities or expanded operation of existing well facilities will be in</p> | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------|
| <p>surface water.</p> <p>AA Implementation of land uses under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Diagram would increase groundwater usage in Martis Valley, which could adversely impact groundwater resources as well as interactions between groundwater and surface water.</p> <p>AB Implementation of land uses under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would increase groundwater usage in Martis Valley, which could adversely impact groundwater resources as well as interactions between groundwater and surface water.</p> <p>AC Implementation of land uses under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would increase groundwater usage in Martis Valley, which could adversely impact groundwater resources as well as interactions between groundwater and surface water.</p> | 10, 12, 13 | | <p>compliance with Section 204(c)1(B) of P.L. 101-618 and/or any subsequent standard set forth in the Truckee River Operation Agreement that requires that the placement be designed to avoid substantial effects to surface water flows or conditions. Well tests, identification of setback from waterway, appropriate hydrologic testing and/or reports from qualified professionals shall be provided verifying that no substantial impact to surface waters will occur.</p> | |
| <p>Impact 4.7.6 Flood Hazard Impacts</p> <p>PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would increase impervious surfaces and would alter drainage</p> | <p>Policies: 6.E.2, 6.E.3, 6.E.4, 6.E.7, 6.E.8, 6.E.9, 6.E.10, 6.F.1, 6.F.3, 6.F.4, 6.F.5.</p> | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------|
| <p>conditions and rates in the Plan area, which would result in potential flooding impacts.</p> <p>AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would increase impervious surfaces and would alter drainage conditions and rates in the Plan area, which would result in potential flooding impacts.</p> <p>AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would increase impervious surfaces and would alter drainage conditions and rates in the Plan area, which would result in potential flooding impacts.</p> <p>AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would increase impervious surfaces and would alter drainage conditions and rates in the Plan area, which would result in potential flooding impacts.</p> | <p>6.F.3, 6.F.4, 6.F.5, 6.F.7, 6.F.9, 6.F.12</p> <p>Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services): 18, 19, 20, 21</p> | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.7.7 Cumulative Water Quality Impacts</p> <p>PP Construction activities and operation of land uses under the Proposed Land Use</p> | <p>Policies: 6.D.1, 6.D.5, 6.C.6, 6.D.6, 6.D.7, 6.E.3, 6.E.6, 6.E.8, 6.F.10, 6.F.11.</p> | CS | Implement Mitigation Measures MM 4.7.1a through c, MM 4.7.2a through e and MM 4.7.3 | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|--|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>Diagram would contribute to water quality impacts from development of other projects in the region.</p> <p>AA Construction activities and operation of land uses under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would contribute to water quality impacts from development of other projects in the region.</p> <p>AB Construction activities and operation of land uses under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would contribute to water quality impacts from development of other projects in the region.</p> <p>AC Construction activities and operation of land uses under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would contribute to water quality impacts from development of other projects in the region.</p> | <p>6.E.10, 6.E.11, 9.D.1, 9.D.2, 9.D.3, 9.D.4, 9.D.5, 9.D.7, 9.D.8, 9.D.9, 9.D.10, 9.F.1, 9.F.2, 9.F.5</p> <p>Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services and Natural Resources Sections): 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18</p> | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.7.8 Cumulative Groundwater Recharge Area Impacts</p> <p>PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would not contribute to a substantial loss of groundwater recharge area.</p> | <p>Policies: 6.D.6, 9.D.9, 9.D.10</p> <p>Implementation Program (Natural Resources Section): 12</p> | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would not contribute to a substantial loss of groundwater recharge area. AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would not contribute to a substantial loss of groundwater recharge area. AC Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would not contribute to a substantial loss of groundwater recharge area. | | | | |
| Impact 4.7.9 Cumulative Groundwater Usage Impacts PP Implementation of land uses under the Proposed Land Use Diagram would contribute to further increases in groundwater usage in Martis Valley, which could adversely impact groundwater resources. AA Implementation of land uses under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would contribute to further increases in groundwater usage in Martis Valley, which could adversely impact | Policies: 6.C.1, 6.C.4 Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services and Natural Resources Sections): 6, 8, 10, 12, 13 | CS | Implement Mitigation Measure MM 4.7.5. | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>groundwater resources.</p> <p>AB Implementation of land uses under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would contribute to further increases in groundwater usage in Martis Valley, which could adversely impact groundwater resources.</p> <p>AC Implementation of land uses under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would contribute to further increases in groundwater usage in Martis Valley, which could adversely impact groundwater resources.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.7.10 Cumulative Flood Hazards</p> <p>PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would increase impervious surfaces and alter drainage conditions and rates in the Plan area, which could contribute to regional flooding impacts.</p> <p>AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would increase impervious surfaces and alter drainage conditions and rates in the Plan area, which could contribute to regional flooding impacts.</p> | <p>Policies: 6.E.2, 6.E.3, 6.E.4, 6.E.7, 6.E.8, 6.E.9, 6.E.10, 6.F.1, 6.F.3, 6.F.4, 6.F.5, 6.F.7, 6.F.9, 6.F.12</p> <p>Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services Section): 18, 19, 20, 21</p> | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would increase impervious surfaces and alter drainage conditions and rates in the Plan area, which could contribute to regional flooding impacts. AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would increase impervious surfaces and alter drainage conditions and rates in the Plan area, which could contribute to regional flooding impacts. | | | | |
| Geology and Soils | | | | |
| Impact 4.8.1 Geologic Stability and Suitability of the Martis Valley Community Plan Area PP Subsequent development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram could expose future residents and structures to geologic instability. However, Community Plan proposed policies and implementation programs would ensure adequate consideration of geologic stability issues. AA Subsequent development under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land | Policies: 9.A.1, 9.A.2, 9.A.3, 9.A.4, 9.A.5, 9.A.6, 9.A.7, 9.A.9 Implementation Programs (Natural Resources Section): 2, 3, 4, 6 | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------|
| <p>Use Map could expose future residents and structures to geologic instability. However, Community Plan proposed policies and implementation programs would ensure adequate consideration of geologic stability issues.</p> <p>AB Subsequent development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map could expose future residents and structures to geologic instability. However, Community Plan proposed policies and implementation programs would ensure adequate consideration of geologic stability issues.</p> <p>AC Subsequent development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map could expose future residents and structures to geologic instability. However, Community Plan proposed policies and implementation programs would ensure adequate consideration of geologic stability issues.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.8.2 Seismic Hazards</p> <p>PP Subsequent development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram could expose future residents and structures to seismic hazards associated with fault</p> | <p>Policies: 9.A.1, 9.A.7, 9.A.8, Implementation Programs (Natural</p> | PS | <p>MM 4.8.2a As part of the geotechnical subsurface investigation work (Geology Implementation Program 2), an onsite seismic hazards analysis for subsequent projects and</p> | LS |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| <p>rupture and ground shaking.</p> <p>AA Subsequent development under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map could expose future residents and structures to seismic hazards associated with fault rupture and ground shaking.</p> <p>AB Subsequent development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map could expose future residents and structures to seismic hazards associated with fault rupture and ground shaking.</p> <p>AC Subsequent development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map could expose future residents and structures to seismic hazards associated with fault rupture and ground shaking.</p> | Resources Section): 2, 5 | | <p>their supporting infrastructure will be performed to further locate and identify active faults. This information shall be utilized to adjust, if needed, the configuration of subsequent projects to ensure future structures will not be located on or near an active faults, traces. Because of their presence additional exploration will be required across these structures in several locations to accurately map their trends across the region. Appropriate setbacks <u>will</u> must then be defined per results of field investigations, and guidelines contained in UBC and CDMG (Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Report 42 standards). No special setbacks or project design modifications will be required if technical studies fail to identify the presence of a suspected fault or if the fault is determined to be inactive.</p> | |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| | | | MM 4.8.2b Future residential units, structures, project utilities, and infrastructure shall be designed to withstand expected seismic forces that could sustain both horizontal and vertical oscillations and net displacements of earth material along local active fault(s). This may include strengthening of foundations, offsets of structures, engineering of flexible utility connections to accommodate warping, and distributive deformation associated with faulting. These designs will meet requirements outlined by Uniform Building Code and California Department of Mines and Geology. | |
| Impact 4.8.3 Soil Erosion PP Subsequent development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram would include minor to major grading over large areas of land that could result in increased soil erosion above existing | Policies: 6.E.3, 6.E.10, 6.E.11, 9.D.1, 9.D.2, 9.D.3, 9.D.4, 9.D.5, 9.D.7, 9.D.8, 9.D.9, 9.D.10, 9.F.2, | PS | Implement Mitigation Measures MM 4.7.1a through c. | LS |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|--|--|---|---------------------------------|
| <p>conditions.</p> <p>AA Subsequent development under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan would include minor to major grading over large areas of land that could result in increased soil erosion above existing conditions.</p> <p>AB Subsequent development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would include minor to major grading over large areas of land that could result in increased soil erosion above existing conditions.</p> <p>AC Subsequent development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would include minor to major grading over large areas of land that could result in increased soil erosion above existing conditions.</p> | <p>9.F.5, 9.H.7, 9.H.8</p> <p>Implementation Programs (Natural Resources Section): 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 15, 18</p> | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.8.4 Avalanche Hazards</p> <p>PP Subsequent development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram may result in the placement structures and residents in areas that could be exposed to avalanche hazards.</p> <p>AA Subsequent development under the</p> | <p>Policies: 9.B.1, 9.B.2</p> <p><u>Implementation Program (Geology): 6</u></p> | PS | <p>MM 4.8.4 During review of any project <u>that</u> would be located along a north-facing slope <u>immediately</u> adjacent to areas with slopes 2930 percent or greater, Placer County shall require each subsequent project to provide the County with an</p> | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| <p>Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map may result in the placement structures and residents in areas that could be exposed to avalanche hazards.</p> <p>AB Subsequent development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map may result in the placement structures and residents in areas that could be exposed to avalanche hazards.</p> <p>AC Subsequent development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map may result in the placement structures and residents in areas that could be exposed to avalanche hazards.</p> | | | <p>provide the County with an avalanche hazard investigation report for their project. This report will document field investigations of surface conditions in areas where construction of all structures is proposed as well as typical snow accumulation and climate conditions. Evaluation of surface materials will be made to evaluate slope stability characteristics of underlying near surface conditions and probable snow conditions that will likely be present during various storm conditions. Avalanche hazard areas shall be mapped and the site design shall be modified to avoid these areas. If avoidance is infeasible, structures to be placed in the avalanche hazard areas shall be designed to withstand anticipated snow loads and conditions of an avalanche consistent with the Placer County Avalanche Management</p> | |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|--|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| | | | Program. | |
| Impact 4.8.5 Cumulative Geologic Impacts PP Development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram could result in site-specific geologic hazards for area residents. AA Development under the existing Martis Valley Community Plan Land Use Map could result in site-specific geologic hazards for area residents. AB Development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map could result in site-specific geologic hazards for area residents. AC Development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map could result in site-specific geologic hazards for area residents. | None required | LS | None required. | LS |
| Biological Resources | | | | |
| Impact 4.9.1 Disturbance to Common Plant Communities PP Subsequent development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the loss of vegetation types | Policies: 9.E.1, 9.E.3, 9.E.4, 9.E.5, 9.E.6, 9.E.7, 9.E.8, 9.E.9, 9.E.10, 9.E.11 | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|--|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>common in the region.</p> <p>AA Subsequent development under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would result in the loss of vegetation types common in the region.</p> <p>AB Subsequent development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would result in the loss of vegetation types common in the region.</p> <p>AC Subsequent development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would result in the loss of vegetation types common in the region.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.9.2 Disturbance to Common Wildlife</p> <p>PP Subsequent development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the disturbance and potential loss of wildlife species common in the region.</p> <p>AA Subsequent development under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would result in the disturbance and potential loss of wildlife species common in the region.</p> <p>AB Subsequent development under the</p> | <p>Policies: 9.G.1, 9.G.2, 9.G.3, 9.G.5, 9. G.6, 9.G.9</p> | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| <p>Alternative 1 Land Use Map would result in the disturbance and potential loss of wildlife species common in the region.</p> <p>AC Subsequent development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would result in the disturbance and potential loss of wildlife species common in the region.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.9.3 Potential Disturbance to Special-Status Plant Species</p> <p>PP Subsequent development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram may impact habitat for special-status plant species.</p> <p>AA Subsequent development under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map may impact habitat for special-status plant species.</p> <p>AB Subsequent development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map may impact habitat for special-status plant species.</p> <p>AC Subsequent development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map may impact habitat for special-status plant species.</p> | <p>Policies: 9.E.5, 9.E.10, 9.F.2, 9.F.4, 9.G.10</p> <p>Implementation Program (Natural Resources Section): 1</p> | PS | <p>MM 4.9.3 The County shall require that biotic resources evaluation for subsequent projects required under Policy 9.G.10 to include a focused plant survey for the following special-status plant species: Donner Pass buckwheat, plumas ivesia, Carson Range rock cress, long-petaled lewisia, Munroe's desert mallow, and American manna grass. The survey shall determine the presence/absence of these species on the site. The surveys shall be conducted by a qualified botanist during the blooming season for each species (in general, from May-August). Plant species listed after the</p> | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| | | | <p>adoption of the Martis Valley Community Plan shall also be included in the survey.</p> <p>If biotic surveys identify the presence of special-status plant species, the subsequent project will be designed to avoid <u>substantial impacts on the plant population that would impair the population's survival</u> including the provision of adequate buffers. If avoidance is <u>determined</u> deemed infeasible, other mitigation <u>measures</u> options shall be <u>imposed</u> considered by the project. These may include, but not limited to, on- or off-site preservation of existing populations, seed and soil collection or plant transplant that ensures that <u>a viable the plant population will survive is maintained</u>. Subsequent projects shall submit a mitigation program for impacted special-status plant species that has been prepared by a qualified</p> | |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| | | | <p>biologist approved by the County and shall include consultation with the appropriate governmental agencies (e.g., U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board) as part of plan implementation."</p> <p>Responsible Agency/ Department: Planning Department</p> <p>Time Frame: On-going</p> <p>Funding: Permit Fees</p> | |
| <p>Impact 4.9.4 Potential Disturbance to Mountain Yellow-Legged Frog</p> <p>PP Subsequent development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram may impact suitable habitat for mountain yellow-legged frog.</p> <p>AA Subsequent development under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map may impact suitable habitat</p> | <p>Policies: 9.E.10, 9.F.1, 9.F.2, 9.F.3, 9.F.4, 9.F.5, 9.F.6, 9.F.7, 9.G.1, 9.G.2, 9.G.3, 9.G.4, 9.G.8, 9.G.9, 9.G.10</p> <p>Implementation Program (Natural</p> | PS | <p>MM 4.9.4 The County shall require that biotic resources evaluation for subsequent projects include a mountain yellow-legged frog habitat suitability assessment be conducted on each parcel proposing a crossing over or development within stream or open water habitat area. The assessment shall include</p> | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| <p>for mountain yellow-legged frog.</p> <p>AB Subsequent development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map may impact suitable habitat for mountain yellow-legged frog.</p> <p>AC Subsequent development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map may impact suitable habitat for mountain yellow-legged frog.</p> | Resources Section): 1 | | <p>a detailed analysis of the habitat conditions present onsite and shall survey stream conditions 500 feet upstream and downstream from the proposed stream crossing. If the results of the habitat suitability survey indicate that potential habitat for this species is not present within 500 feet up or down stream of the crossing, no further study is required.</p> <p>However, if potential habitat for this species is identified during the assessment, County shall condition projects involving disturbance of a waterway channel to perform the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct pre-construction surveys for the mountain yellow-legged frog during the breeding season by a qualified biologist. If frogs are identified in the construction area, the biologist shall contact CDFG | |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| | | | <p>and/or USFWS regarding the proper methods of moving the species an appropriate off-site location prior to the onset of construction activities at the waterways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring of construction activities within waterways until construction activities in the waterways is complete. • Conduct training session for all construction personnel regarding the mountain yellow-legged frog, including a description of the species and its habitat and materials on species in order to assist in identifying species in the field. <p>Revegetation and recontouring of channel conditions generally consistent with pre-construction conditions. Responsible Agency/ Department: Planning Department</p> | |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| | | | Time Frame: On-going Funding: Permit Fees Implement Mitigation Measures MM 4.6.1a through c, and MM 4.7.2a through e. | |
| Impact 4.9.5 Potential Disturbance to Lahontan Cutthroat Trout PP The implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram may disturb habitat for Lahontan cutthroat trout and impact current recovery efforts by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. AA The implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map may disturb habitat for Lahontan cutthroat trout and impact current recovery efforts by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. AB The implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map may disturb habitat for Lahontan cutthroat trout and impact current recovery efforts by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. AC The implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map may disturb habitat for Lahontan cutthroat trout and impact current recovery efforts by the U.S. Fish | Policies: 9.F.1, 9.F.2, 9.F.3, 9.F.4, 9.F.5, 9.F.6, 9.F.7, 9.G.1, 9.G.2, 9.G.3, 9.G.4, 9.G.6, 9.G.8, 9.G.9, 9.G.10 Implementation Program (Natural Resources Section): 1 | PS | MM 4.9.5a The County shall require that construction activities within the channels of waterways identified to be potential spawning habitat of the Lahontan cutthroat trout shall not <u>materially impair habitat conditions.</u> The <u>County shall cooperate with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service if future recovery planning activities for the species includes Plan area waterways. occur during the spawning season (April through July).</u> MM 4.9.5b No structures shall be permitted in streams or watercourses within the Plan area that would result in the blockage of water flow <u>sufficient to create ing a barrier to fish movement."</u> | LS |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| and Wildlife Service. | | | barrier to fish movement.” Implement Mitigation Measures MM 4.6.1a through c, and MM 4.7.2a through e. | |
| Impact 4.9.6 Potential Disturbance to Nesting Raptors and Other Migratory Birds PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram could result in the direct and temporary impacts on nesting special-status bird species, raptors, and other migratory birds. AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map could result in the direct and temporary impacts on nesting special-status bird species, raptors, and other migratory birds. AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map could result in the direct and temporary impacts on nesting special-status bird species, raptors, and other migratory birds. AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map could result in the direct and temporary impacts on nesting special-status bird species, raptors, and other migratory birds. | Policies: 9.E.3, 9.E.4, 9.E.5, 9.E.6, 9.E.7, 9.E.9, 9.E.10, 9.E.12, 9.F.1, 9.F.2, 9.F.4, 9.F.5, 9.F.6, 9.G.1, 9.G.2, 9.G.3, 9.G.4, 9.G.5, 9.G.8, 9.G.9, 9.G.10 Implementation Program (Natural Resources Section): 1 | PS | MM 4.9.6 If active nests are found during surveys associated with implementation of Policy 9.G.10, the County shall require mapping identifying the locations of identified nests <u>of endangered or threatened bird species or the nests of protected raptors or migratory birds</u> . The subsequent project will be required to conduct focused nest surveys 30 days prior to the beginning of construction activities by a qualified biologist in order to determine if active nests are still present. If active nests are found, the County shall be notified on the status of the nests and no construction activities shall take place within 500 feet of the nest to avoid disturbance until the birds leave the nest, or a time deemed | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|------------------------|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| other migratory birds. | | | <p>acceptable (e.g., when the juveniles have fledged) by the biologist. <u>The 500-foot buffer may be reduced based on various factors including, but not limited to, vegetation and topographic screening, sensitivity of the species to disturbance and consultation with California Department of Fish and Game.</u> Monitoring reports summarizing nest activities shall be submitted to the County until the nest is determined to be inactive. Trees containing nest sites that must be removed shall be removed during the non-breeding season.</p> <p>If active nests that are identified involve federal and/or state listed species (under the Federal Endangered Species Act and the California Endangered Species Act) within or adjacent to the area of planned disturbance, additional setbacks,</p> | |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------|
| | | | <p>restrictions and/or mitigation may be required from California Department of Fish and Game and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as part of agency permitting to ensure no take of the species. Nest sites of federal and/or state listed species shall not be taken, unless approved by California Department of Fish and Game and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</p> <p>Responsible Agency/ Department: Planning Department</p> <p>Time Frame: On-going</p> <p>Funding: Permit Fees</p> | |
| <p>Impact 4.9.7 Potential Disturbance to Special-Status Bat Species</p> <p>PP The implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram may remove potential roosting habitats for special-status bat species.</p> | <p>Policies: 9.E.3, 9.E.4, 9.E.5, 9.E.6, 9.E.7, 9.E.9, 9.E.10, 9.E.12, 9.F.1, 9.F.2, 9.F.4, 9.F.5, 9.F.6, 9.G.1, 9.G.2, 9.G.3, 9.G.4, 9.G.5,</p> | PS | <p>MM 4.9.7 If bat roosts are identified on site as a result of surveys required by Policy 9.G.10, the County shall require that the bats be safely flushed from the sites where roosting habitat is planned to be removed prior to May of</p> | LS |

S - Significant

PS-Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant

CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| AA The implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map may remove potential roosting habitats for special-status bat species. AB The implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map may remove potential roosting habitats for special-status bat species. AC The implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map may remove potential roosting habitats for special-status bat species. | 9.G.8, 9.G.9, 9.G.10 Implementation Program (Natural Resources Section): <u>1,2,3,24</u> | | each construction phase (maternity roosts are generally occupied from May to August) prior to the onset of construction activities. The removal of the roosting sites shall occur during the time of day when the roost is unoccupied. <u>Replacement roost habitat (e.g., bat boxes) will be provided for roosting sites removed.</u> Responsible Agency/ Department: Planning Department Time Frame: On-going Funding: Permit Fees | |
| Impact 4.9.8 Potential Disturbance to Sierra Nevada Red Fox, California Wolverine, Sierra Nevada Snowshoe Hare, Pacific Fisher, Sierra Nevada Mountain Beaver, and Pine Marten PP The implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram may remove potential habitat for Sierra Nevada red fox, California wolverine, Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare, pacific fisher, Sierra | Policies: 9.E.3, 9.E.4, 9.E.5, 9.E.6, 9.F.1, 9.F.2, 9.G.1, 9.G.2, 9.G.3, 9.G.4, 9.G.5, 9.G.6, 9.G.7, 9.G.8, 9.G.9, 9.G.10 Implementation | PS | MM 4.9.8 The County shall require <u>a habitat suitability evaluation or</u> focused surveys for Sierra Nevada red fox, California wolverine, Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare, pacific fisher, Sierra Nevada mountain beaver, and pine marten as part of surveys required by Policy 9.G.10. Effective | LS |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant

CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------|
| <p>Nevada mountain beaver, and pine marten.</p> <p>AA The implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map may remove potential habitat for Sierra Nevada red fox, California wolverine, Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare, pacific fisher, Sierra Nevada mountain beaver, and pine marten.</p> <p>AB The implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map may remove habitat for Sierra Nevada red fox, California wolverine, Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare, pacific fisher, Sierra Nevada mountain beaver, and pine marten.</p> <p>AC The implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map may remove habitat for Sierra Nevada red fox, California wolverine, Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare, pacific fisher, Sierra Nevada mountain beaver, and pine marten.</p> | <p>Program (Natural Resources Section): <u>1,2,3,20,23,24</u></p> | | <p>Policy 9.G.10. <u>Effective movement corridors will be provided in projects areas with suitable habitat.</u> If active den/burrow sites for the Sierra Nevada red fox, California wolverine, Sierra Nevada snowshoe hare, pacific fisher, Sierra Nevada mountain beaver, and/or pine marten dens/nests are identified, the mitigation plan shall be developed in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game and/or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to ensure no animals are killed and that den/burrow sites are properly addressed. Measures may include, but not limited to, redesign of the project (Placer County General Plan Policy 6.C.6) to provide adequately sized open space areas and corridors around den/burrow sites, capture and relocation of the species. Subsequent projects shall submit the mitigation plan that has</p> | |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|--|--|---|---------------------------------|
| | | | <p>been reviewed and approved the appropriate governmental agencies (e.g., U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game) and the necessary regulatory permits obtained for the Sierra Nevada red fox and California wolverine (California Endangered Species Act) to the County prior to development activities.</p> <p>Responsible Agency/ Department: Planning Department</p> <p>Time Frame: On-going</p> <p>Funding: Permit Fees</p> | |
| Impact 4.9.9 Disturbance to Riparian Habitat PP The implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram may remove riparian scrub habitat. However, implementation of proposed Community Plan policies would ensure no net loss of riparian areas. | Policies: 9.E.3, 9.E.10, 9.F.1, 9.F.2, 9.F.4, 9.F.5, 9.F.6 Implementation Program (Natural Resources Section): 1.2.3.20 | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|--|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| AA The implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map may remove riparian scrub habitat. However, implementation of proposed Community Plan policies would ensure no net loss of riparian areas. AB The implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map may remove riparian scrub habitat. However, implementation of proposed Community Plan policies would ensure no net loss of riparian areas. AC The implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map may remove riparian scrub habitat. However, implementation of proposed Community Plan policies would ensure no net loss of riparian areas. | Section): <u>1,2,3,20</u> | | | |
| Impact 4.9.10 Loss of Wetland Areas PP The implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram may disturb wetland areas. However, implementation of proposed Community Plan policies would ensure no net loss of wetland resources. AA The implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan may disturb | Policies: 9.F.1, 9.F.2, 9.F.3, 9.F.4, 9.F.5, 9.F.6, 9.F.7 Implementation Program (Natural Resources Section): <u>1,2,3,20</u> | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------|
| <p>wetland areas. However, implementation of proposed Community Plan policies would ensure no net loss of wetland resources.</p> <p>AB The implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map may disturb wetland areas. However, implementation of proposed Community Plan policies would ensure no net loss of wetland resources.</p> <p>AC The implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map may disturb wetland areas. However, implementation of proposed Community Plan policies would ensure no net loss of wetland resources.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.9.11 Disturbance to Wildlife Movement</p> <p>PP The implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram may block local wildlife movement as well as established deer migration movement corridors.</p> <p>AA The implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map may block local wildlife movement as well as established deer migration movement</p> | <p>Policies: 9.D.1, 9.D.4, 9.D.9, 9.D.10, 9.E.3, 9.E.4, 9.E.6, 9.G.1, 9.G.2, 9.G.3, 9.G.5, 9.G.8, 9.G.9, 9.G.10</p> <p>Implementation Program (Natural Resources Section):</p> | PS | MM 4.9.11a The County shall require deer migration surveys for projects located within or adjacent to the 3 corridors identified in Figure 4.9-5 of the Martis Valley Community Plan Update EIR, as part of surveys required by Policy 9.G.10. The surveys shall define the extent of deer movement across the subject property and will refine the extent of | LS |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| <p>corridors.</p> <p>AB The implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map may block local wildlife movement as well as established deer migration movement corridors.</p> <p>AC The implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map may block local wildlife movement as well as established deer migration movement corridors.</p> | <p><u>1,2,3,19,20</u></p> | | <p>the deer corridor onsite. If a deer migration corridor is identified, a functional corridor shall be maintained as open space. The exact width, design and amount of allowed disturbance (e.g., trails, recreation facilities, golf courses) in the corridor shall be based on the results of the survey and shall take into account connections with adjacent open space areas, vegetation and the seasonal cover and forage requirements of the migratory deer. The open space corridor shall be mapped and its design clearly identified.</p> <p>Responsible Agency/ Department: Planning Department</p> <p>Time Frame: On-going</p> <p>Funding: Permit Fees</p> <p>MM 4.9.11b The County shall require that subsequent projects</p> | |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| | | | <p>designate building envelopes as the allowed area of disturbance on an individual parcel basis to maximize the preservation of existing vegetation. Where possible, contiguous stands of trees within development areas shall be preserved and incorporated into the project design.</p> <p>Fencing shall be limited to the building envelope of the parcel and not along parcel lines. If fencing is required along a parcel boundary, only post and cable, or other fencing methods easily cleared by wildlife, shall be installed.</p> <p>Responsible Agency/ Department: Planning Department</p> <p>Time Frame: On-going</p> <p>Funding: Permit Fees</p> | |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| <p>Impact 4.9.12 Loss of Special-Status Species and their Habitat, Interference with Wildlife Movement, and Fragmentation of Habitat</p> <p>PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would contribute to the loss of habitat and forage lands, habitat degradation due to encroaching urbanization, direct and indirect impacts to sensitive species, habitat fragmentation, obstruction of movement corridors, and conflicts between wildlife and human activity.</p> <p>AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would contribute to the loss of habitat and forage lands, habitat degradation due to encroaching urbanization, direct and indirect impacts to sensitive species, habitat fragmentation, obstruction of movement corridors, and conflicts between wildlife and human activity.</p> <p>AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would contribute to the loss of habitat and forage lands, habitat degradation due to encroaching urbanization, direct and indirect impacts to sensitive species, habitat fragmentation, obstruction of</p> | <p>Policies: 9.D.1, 9.D.4, 9.D.9, 9.D.10, 9.E.1, 9.E.3, 9.E.4, 9.E.5, 9.E.6, 9.E.7, 9.E.8, 9.E.9, 9.E.10, 9.E.11, 9.F.1, 9.F.2, 9.F.4, 9.F.5, 9.F.6, 9.F.7, 9.G.1, 9.G.2, 9.G.3, 9.G.4, 9.G.5, 9.G.6, 9.G.9, 9.G.10</p> <p>Implementation Program (Natural Resources Section): <u>1,2,3,19,20,23,24</u></p> | CS | Implement Mitigation Measures MM 4.9.3, MM 4.9.4, MM 4.9.5a and b, MM 4.9.6, MM 4.9.7, MM 4.9.8 and MM 4.9.11a and b. | SU |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------|
| <p>movement corridors, and conflicts between wildlife and human activity.</p> <p>AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would contribute to the loss of habitat and forage lands, habitat degradation due to encroaching urbanization, direct and indirect impacts to sensitive species, habitat fragmentation, obstruction of movement corridors, and conflicts between wildlife and human activity.</p> | | | | |
| Cultural Resources | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.10.1 Impacts to Prehistoric and Historic Resources in the Plan Area</p> <p>PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram could result in the disturbance of known and undiscovered prehistoric and historic resources in the Plan area.</p> <p>AA Implementation of the existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map could result in the disturbance of known and undiscovered prehistoric and historic resources in the Plan area.</p> <p>AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map could result in the disturbance of known and undiscovered</p> | <p>Policies: 8.A.1, 8.A.2, 8.A.3, 8.A.4, 8.A.5, 8.A.6, 8.A.7, 8.A.8, 8.A.9</p> <p>Implementation Programs (Cultural Resources Section): 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9,</p> | PS | <p>MM 4.10.1 The County shall require all new development to suspend construction activities and contact the County when any cultural resources (e.g., structural features, unusual amounts of bone or shell, human remains, artifacts, human remains, architectural remains or significant paleontological resources) are discovered. In the event cultural resources or paleontological resources are discovered, the County shall retain a qualified</p> | LS |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| <p>disturbance of known and undiscovered prehistoric and historic resources in the Plan area.</p> <p>AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map could result in the disturbance of known and undiscovered prehistoric and historic resources in the Plan area.</p> | | | <p>cultural resource specialist or paleontologist to assess the finds and develop mitigation measures for the protection, recordation, or removal of the cultural resources or paleontological resources. These measures may also include consultation with local Native American communities and the Native American Commission on cultural resource finds. If human remains are discovered, all work must stop in the immediate vicinity of the find, and the County Coroner must be notified, according to Section 7050.5 of California's Health and Safety Code. If the remains are Native American, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which in turn will inform a most likely descendant. The descendant will then recommend to the landowner appropriate disposition of the remains</p> | |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| | | | <p>and any grave goods.</p> <p><u>Prior to commencing construction, the project applicant shall prepare a mitigation monitoring plan in accordance with the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology guidelines. The mitigation monitoring plan shall include monitoring by a qualified paleontologist during construction and a program for the evaluation of paleontological resources discovered. If paleontological resources are discovered during construction, the paleontologist shall be responsible for recovery of any fossils discovered, determining their significance, identification of potential subsurface investigations based on fossils discovered, and placing the fossils in a museum collection.</u></p> | |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------|
| Impact 4.10.2 Paleontological Resource Impacts PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the disturbance of Pleistocene nonmarine sedimentary rocks (Prosser Creek Alluvium) and Quaternary alluvium geologic units, which have potential to contain paleontological resources. AA Implementation of the existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would result in the disturbance of Pleistocene nonmarine sedimentary rocks (Prosser Creek Alluvium) and Quaternary alluvium geologic units, which have potential to contain paleontological resources. AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would result in the disturbance of Pleistocene nonmarine sedimentary rocks (Prosser Creek Alluvium) and Quaternary alluvium geologic units, which have potential to contain paleontological resources. AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would result in the disturbance of Pleistocene nonmarine | Policies: 8.A.2, 8.A.5, 8.A.6 Implementation Programs (Cultural Resources Section): 1, 3, 5 | PS | Implement Mitigation Measure MM 4.10.1. | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| sedimentary rocks (Prosser Creek Alluvium) and Quaternary alluvium geologic units, which have potential to contain paleontological resources. | | | | |
| Impact 4.10.3 Cumulative Impacts to Prehistoric and Historic Resources in the Martis Valley Area PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram in combination with proposed and planned development in the Martis Valley area could contribute to the disturbance of known and undiscovered prehistoric and historic resources in the Martis Valley area. AA Implementation of the existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map in combination with proposed and planned development in the Martis Valley area could contribute to the disturbance of known and undiscovered prehistoric and historic resources in the Martis Valley area. AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map in combination with proposed and planned development in the Martis Valley area could contribute to the disturbance of known and | Policies: 8.A.1, 8.A.2, 8.A.3, 8.A.4, 8.A.5, 8.A.6, 8.A.7, 8.A.8, 8.A.9 Implementation Programs (Cultural Resources Section): 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, | CS | Implement Mitigation Measure MM 4.10.1. | LS |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| <p>undiscovered prehistoric and historic resources in the Martis Valley area.</p> <p>AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map in combination with proposed and planned development in the Martis Valley area could contribute to the disturbance of known and undiscovered prehistoric and historic resources in the Martis Valley area.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.10.4 Cumulative Impacts to Paleontological Resource Impacts in the Martis Valley Area</p> <p>PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram in combination with proposed and planned development in the Martis Valley area could contribute to the loss of paleontological resources in the Martis Valley area.</p> <p>AA Implementation of the existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map in combination with proposed and planned development in the Martis Valley area could contribute to the loss of paleontological resources in the Martis Valley area.</p> <p>AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map in combination with</p> | <p>Policies: 8.A.2, 8.A.5, 8.A.6</p> <p>Implementation Programs (Cultural Resources Section): 1, 3, 5</p> | CS | Implement Mitigation Measure MM 4.10.1. | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------|
| <p>proposed and planned development in the Martis Valley area could contribute to the loss of paleontological resources in the Martis Valley area.</p> <p>AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map in combination with proposed and planned development in the Martis Valley area could contribute to the loss of paleontological resources in the Martis Valley area.</p> | | | | |
| Public Services | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.11.1.1 Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services</p> <p>PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would increase the population of the fire protection and emergency medical services providers' service area. The existing facilities, personnel and equipment are sufficient to accommodate the buildout conditions associated with this land use map. Additionally, the existing funding mechanisms are sufficient to pay for increased impacts on services. However, proposed development associated with the Proposed Land Use Diagram are located outside of Truckee</p> | <p>Policies: 6.H.3, 6.H.4, 6.H.5, 6.H.7, 6.H.14</p> <p>Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services Section): 1, 2, 4</p> | S | <p>MM 4.11.1.1 The County shall require that property currently located outside of the Truckee Fire Protection District or Northstar CSD's service areas be annexed into one of the fire districts prior to approval of any entitlement that allows development to occur within these sections.</p> | LS |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>Fire Protection District and the Northstar CSD's service areas. The areas that would be located outside of the fire protection districts' service areas include: sections 21, 27, 33 and 34 of Township 17 North, Range 17 East.</p> <p>AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would increase the population of the fire protection and emergency medical services providers' service area. The existing facilities, personnel and equipment are sufficient to accommodate the buildout conditions associated with this alternative. Additionally, the existing funding mechanisms are sufficient to pay for increased impacts on services. However, proposed development associated with Alternative AA are located outside of Truckee Fire Protection District and the Northstar CSD's service areas. The areas that would be located outside of the fire protection districts' service areas include: sections 21, 26, 27, 28, 33, 34 and 35 of Township 17 North, Range 17 East; and sections 4, 5, 8 and 9 of Township 16 North, Range 17 East.</p> | | | | |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would increase the population of the fire protection and emergency medical services providers' service area. The existing facilities, personnel and equipment are sufficient to accommodate the buildout conditions associated with this alternative. Additionally, the existing funding mechanisms are sufficient to pay for increased impacts on services. However, proposed development associated with Alternative AB are located outside of Truckee Fire Protection District and the Northstar CSD's service areas. The areas that would be located outside of the fire protection districts' service areas include sections 21 and 28 of Township 17 North, Range 17 East.</p> | | | | |
| <p>AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would increase the population of the fire protection and emergency medical services providers' service area. The existing facilities, personnel and equipment are sufficient to accommodate the buildout conditions associated with this alternative. Additionally, the existing funding mechanisms are sufficient to</p> | | | | |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| pay for increased impacts on services. However, proposed development associated with Alternative AC are located outside of Truckee Fire Protection District and the Northstar CSD's service areas. The areas that would be located outside of the fire protection districts' service areas include sections 21 and 28 of Township 17 North, Range 17 East. | | | | |
| Impact 4.11.1.2 Wildland Fire Hazards PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would locate homes and structures in wooded and diverse terrain, which would expose residents to wildland fire hazards. AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would locate homes and structures in wooded and diverse terrain, which would expose residents to wildland fire hazards. AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would locate homes and structures in wooded and diverse terrain, which would expose residents to wildland fire hazards. | Policies: 6.H.9, 6.H.11, 6.H.12, 6.H.13, 6.H.14, 6.H.15, 6.H.17, 6.H.21, 6.H.22 Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services Section): 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would locate homes and structures in wooded and diverse terrain, which would expose residents to wildland fire hazards. | | | | |
| Impact 4.11.1.3 Cumulative Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in residential uses outside of local fire district service areas. This would place future residents at risk of a loss resulting from a structural fire and contribute to cumulative fire protection and emergency service demands in the Plan area. AA Implementation of Alternative AA would result in residential uses outside of local fire district service areas. This would place future residents at risk of a loss resulting from a structural fire and contribute to cumulative fire protection and emergency service demands in the Plan area. AB Implementation of Alternative AB would result in residential uses outside of local fire district service areas. This would place future residents at risk of a loss | Policies: 6.H.3, 6.H.4, 6.H.5, 6.H.7, 6.H.14 Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services Section): 1, 2, 4 | CS | Implement Mitigation Measure MM 4.11.1.1. | LS |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|--|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>resulting from a structural fire and contribute to cumulative fire protection and emergency service demands in the Plan area.</p> <p>AC Implementation of Alternative AC would result in residential uses outside of local fire district service areas. This would place future residents at risk of a loss resulting from a structural fire and contribute to cumulative fire protection and emergency service demands in the Plan area.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.11.1.4 Cumulative Wildland Fire Hazard</p> <p>PP Development under the Proposed Land Use Diagram would locate additional residences within wildland fire hazard zones under cumulative conditions.</p> <p>AA Development under the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would locate additional residences within wildland fire hazard zones under cumulative conditions.</p> <p>AB Development under the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would locate additional residences within wildland fire hazard</p> | <p>Policies: 6.H.9, 6.H.11, 6.H.12, 6.H.13, 6.H.14, 6.H.15, 6.H.17, 6.H.21, 6.H.22</p> <p>Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services Section): 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29</p> | LS | None Required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>zones under cumulative conditions.</p> <p>AC Development under the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would locate additional residences within wildland fire hazard zones under cumulative conditions.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.11.2.1 Law Enforcement Services</p> <p>PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in an increased demand for sheriff/police protection.</p> <p>AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would result in an increased demand for sheriff/police protection.</p> <p>AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would result in an increased demand for sheriff/police protection.</p> <p>AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would result in an increased demand for sheriff/police protection.</p> | <p>Policies: 6.G.1, 6.G.2, 6.G.3, 6.G.4</p> <p>Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services Section): 22, 23</p> | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS – Less Than Significant
CS – Cumulative Significant

SU – Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|--|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Impact 4.11.2.2 Cumulative Law Enforcement Services PP Under cumulative conditions, implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in an increased demand for sheriff/police protection in the region. AA Under cumulative conditions, implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would result in an increased demand for sheriff/police protection in the region. AB Under cumulative conditions, implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would result in an increased demand for sheriff/police protection in the region. AC Under cumulative conditions, implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would result in an increased demand for sheriff/police protection in the region. | Policies: 6.G.1, 6.G.2, 6.G.3, 6.G.4 Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services Section): 22, 23 | LS | None required. | LS |
| Impact 4.11.3.1 Impacts on School Services PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would increase student enrollment at the Tahoe Truckee Unified | Policies: 6.I.3, 6.I.4, 6.I.5, 6.I.6, 6.I.7, 6.I.8, 6.I.9 Implementation | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|--|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>School District's schools. Additional development associated with this alternative would impact TTUSD's current school facilities and would require additional schools to serve the growing population.</p> <p>AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would increase student enrollment at the Tahoe Truckee Unified School District's schools. Additional development associated with this alternative would impact TTUSD's current school facilities and would require additional schools to serve the growing population.</p> <p>AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would increase student enrollment at the Tahoe Truckee Unified School District's schools. Additional development associated with this alternative would impact TTUSD's current school facilities and would require additional schools to serve the growing population.</p> <p>AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would increase student enrollment at the Tahoe Truckee Unified School District's schools.</p> | <p>Programs (Public Facilities and Services Section): 30</p> | | | |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Impact 4.11.3.2 Cumulative Impacts on School Services PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would contribute to a cumulative increase in student enrollment at the Tahoe Truckee Unified School District's schools. Additional development associated with this alternative would impact TTUSD's school facilities and would require additional schools to serve the student population under cumulative conditions. AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would contribute to a cumulative increase in student enrollment at the Tahoe Truckee Unified School District's schools. Additional development associated with this alternative would impact TTUSD's school facilities and would require additional schools to serve the student population under cumulative conditions. AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would contribute to a cumulative increase in student enrollment at the Tahoe Truckee Unified School District's schools. Additional development associated with this | Policies: 6.I.3, 6.I.4, 6.I.5, 6.I.6, 6.I.7, 6.I.8, 6.I.9 Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services Section): 30 | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| <p>alternative would impact TTUSD's current school facilities and would require additional schools to serve the student population under cumulative conditions.</p> <p>AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would contribute to a cumulative increase in student enrollment at the Tahoe Truckee Unified School District's schools. Additional development associated with this alternative would impact TTUSD's current school facilities and would require additional schools to serve the student population under cumulative conditions.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.11.4.1 Water Facilities and Distribution Systems</p> <p>PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would increase the demand for water facilities and distribution systems in the Plan area, including new systems, supplies, and infrastructure.</p> <p>AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would increase the demand for water facilities and distribution systems in the Plan area, including new systems,</p> | <p>Policies: 6.C.1, 6.C.7</p> <p>Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services Section): 9 and 10</p> | S | <p>MM 4.11.4.1 The County shall require subsequent projects to demonstrate that adequate water distribution systems and connections to existing systems will be available and will be able to provide adequate flow and water quality consistent with local, state, and federal standards.</p> | LS |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>supplies, and infrastructure.</p> <p>AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would increase the demand for water facilities and distribution systems in the Plan area, including new systems, supplies, and infrastructure.</p> <p>AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would increase the demand for water facilities and distribution systems in the Plan area, including new systems, supplies, and infrastructure.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.11.4.2 Cumulative Impacts on Water Facilities and Distribution Systems</p> <p>PP Under cumulative conditions, implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would not increase the demand for water facilities and distribution systems outside of the Plan area, including new systems, supplies, and infrastructure.</p> <p>AA Under cumulative conditions, implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would not increase the demand for</p> | <p>Policies: 6.C.1, 6.C.7</p> <p>Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services Section): 9 and 10</p> | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>water facilities and distribution systems outside of the Plan area, including new systems, supplies, and infrastructure.</p> <p>AB Under cumulative conditions, implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would not increase the demand for water facilities and distribution systems outside of the Plan area, including new systems, supplies, and infrastructure.</p> <p>AC Under cumulative conditions, implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would not increase the demand for water facilities and distribution systems outside of the Plan area, including new systems, supplies, and infrastructure.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.11.5.1 Wastewater Service</p> <p>PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would require additional capacity in the WRP and the extension of sewer trunk lines to serve additional residents, businesses, and recreational uses within the Plan area.</p> <p>AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would require additional capacity in the</p> | <p>Policies: 6.D.1, 6.D.2, 6.D.3, 6.D.4, 6.D.5, 6.D.6, 6.D.7</p> <p>Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services Section): 14 and 15</p> | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>would require additional capacity in the WRP and the extension of sewer trunk lines to serve additional residents, businesses, and recreational uses within the Plan area.</p> <p>AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would require additional capacity in the WRP and the extension of sewer trunk lines to serve additional residents, businesses, and recreational uses within the Plan area.</p> <p>AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would require additional capacity in the WRP and the extension of sewer trunk lines to serve additional residents, businesses, and recreational uses within the Plan area.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.11.5.2 Cumulative Wastewater Service</p> <p>PP Under cumulative conditions, implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would require additional capacity in the WRP and the extension of sewer trunk lines to serve additional residents, businesses, and recreational uses within the Plan area.</p> <p>AA Under cumulative conditions,</p> | <p>Policies: 6.D.1, 6.D.2, 6.D.3, 6.D.4, 6.D.5, 6.D.6, 6.D.7</p> <p>Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services Section): 14 and 15</p> | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

*Placer County
May 2003*

*Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report*

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would require additional capacity in the WRP and the extension of sewer trunk lines to serve additional residents, businesses, and recreational uses within the Plan area.</p> <p>AB Under cumulative conditions, implementation of Alternative 1 Land Use Map would require additional capacity in the WRP and the extension of sewer trunk lines to serve additional residents, businesses, and recreational uses within the Plan area.</p> <p>AC Under cumulative conditions, implementation of Alternative 2 Land Use Map would require additional capacity in the WRP and the extension of sewer trunk lines to serve additional residents, businesses, and recreational uses within the Plan area.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.11.6.1 Solid Waste Disposal</p> <p>PP The Proposed Land Use Diagram would require solid waste disposal services. However, the solid waste provider, Tahoe-Truckee Sierra Disposal (TTSD), is capable of accommodating buildout of</p> | None required. | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>the Plan area.</p> <p>AA The Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would require solid waste disposal services. However, the solid waste provider, Tahoe-Truckee Sierra Disposal (TTSD), is capable of accommodating buildout of the Plan area.</p> <p>AB Alternative 1 Land Use Map would require solid waste disposal services. However, the solid waste provider, Tahoe-Truckee Sierra Disposal (TTSD), is capable of accommodating buildout of the Plan area.</p> <p>AC Alternative 2 Land Use Map would require solid waste disposal services. However, the solid waste provider, Tahoe-Truckee Sierra Disposal (TTSD), is capable of accommodating buildout of the Plan area.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.11.6.2 Cumulative Solid Waste Disposal</p> <p>PP Under cumulative conditions, the Proposed Land Use Diagram would require solid waste disposal services. However, the solid waste provider, Tahoe-Truckee Sierra Disposal (TTSD), is</p> | None required. | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

*Placer County
May 2003*

*Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report*

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| <p>capable of accommodating buildout of the Plan area.</p> <p>AA Under cumulative conditions, the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would require solid waste disposal services. However, the solid waste provider, Tahoe-Truckee Sierra Disposal (TTSD), is capable of accommodating buildout of the Plan area.</p> <p>AB Under cumulative conditions, Alternative 1 Land Use Map would require solid waste disposal services. However, the solid waste provider, Tahoe-Truckee Sierra Disposal (TTSD), is capable of accommodating buildout of the Plan area.</p> <p>AC Under cumulative conditions, Alternative 2 Land Use Map would require solid waste disposal services. However, the solid waste provider, Tahoe-Truckee Sierra Disposal (TTSD), is capable of accommodating buildout of the Plan area.</p> | | | | |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|--|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Impact 4.11.7.1 Availability of Electrical Energy PP Development associated with the Proposed Land Use Diagram would increase the demand for electricity. AA Development associated with the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would increase the demand for electricity. AB Development associated with Alternative 1 Land Use Map would increase the demand for electricity. AC Development associated with Alternative 2 Land Use Map would increase the demand for electricity. | • Policy: 2.B.5 Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services Section): 1; (General): 2, 5; (Utilities): 31 | LS | None required. | LS |
| Impact 4.11.7.2 Increased Demand for Natural Gas PP Development associated with the Proposed Land Use Diagram would increase the demand for natural gas. AA Development associated with the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would increase the demand for natural gas. | Policy: 2.B.5 Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services Section): 1; (General): 2, 5; (Utilities): 31 | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| <p>for natural gas.</p> <p>AB Development associated with Alternative 1 Land Use Map would increase the demand for natural gas.</p> <p>AC Development associated with Alternative 2 Land Use Map would increase the demand for natural gas.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.11.7.3 Extension of Electrical, Natural Gas and Telephone Infrastructure</p> <p>PP The Proposed Land Use Diagram would result in the extension of substantial electrical, natural gas and telephone infrastructure that may impact the environment.</p> <p>AA The Existing Martis Valley Land Use Plan would result in the extension of substantial electrical, natural gas and telephone infrastructure that may impact the environment.</p> <p>AB Alternative 1 Land Use Map would result in the extension of substantial electrical, natural gas and telephone infrastructure that may impact the environment.</p> <p>AC Alternative 2 Land Use Map would result in the extension of substantial electrical,</p> | <p>Policy: 2.B.5</p> <p>Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services Section): 1;</p> <p>(General): 2, 5;</p> <p>(Utilities): 31</p> | PS | <p>MM 4.11.7.3 The County shall require new utility infrastructure and extensions for electrical, natural gas and telephone services avoid to the extent feasible sensitive natural resources (e.g., wetlands, riparian habitat, sensitive habitats), be located so as to not be visually obtrusive, and, if possible, be located within roadway rights-of-ways or existing utility easements. Infrastructure siting shall comply with the policy and implementation programs set forth in Sections IV, VI, VIII, IX, and X of the Community Plan.</p> | LS |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|--|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| natural gas and telephone infrastructure that may impact the environment. | | | | |
| Impact 4.11.7.4 Cumulative Availability of Electrical Energy PP Under cumulative conditions, development associated with the Proposed Land Use Diagram would increase the demand for electricity. AA Under cumulative conditions, development associated with the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would increase the demand for electricity. AB Under cumulative conditions, development associated with Alternative 1 Land Use Map would increase the demand for electricity. AC Under cumulative conditions, development associated with Alternative 2 Land Use Map would increase the demand for electricity. | Policy: 2.B.5 Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services Section): 1 (General): 2, 5 (Utilities): 31 | LS | None required. | LS |
| Impact 4.11.7.5 Cumulative Demand for Natural Gas PP Under cumulative conditions, development associated with the Proposed Land Use Diagram would | Policy: 2.B.5 Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Services | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------|
| <p>increase the demand for natural gas.</p> <p>AA Under cumulative conditions, development associated with the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would increase the demand for natural gas.</p> <p>AB Under cumulative conditions, development associated with Alternative 1 Land Use Map would increase the demand for natural gas.</p> <p>AC Under cumulative conditions, development associated with Alternative 2 Land Use Map would increase the demand for natural gas.</p> | <p>Section):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section IV: 1 • Section VI (General): 2, 5 • Section VI (Utilities): 31 | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.11.8.1 Parks and Recreation Facilities</p> <p>PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would increase the demand for parks and recreation facilities.</p> <p>AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would increase the demand for parks and recreation facilities.</p> <p>AB Implementation of the Alternative 1</p> | <p>Policies: 7.A.1, 7.A.2, 7.A.3, 7.A.4, 7.A.5, 7.B.1, 7.B.2, 7.B.3, 7.B.4, 7.B.5, 7.C.1</p> <p>Implementation Programs (Public Facilities and Service Section): 1, 2, 3</p> | PS | MM 4.11.8.1 Placer County and the Truckee Donner Recreation and Park District shall establish a mechanism for transferring parkland and recreational facilities within the Plan area to TDRPD. | LS |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|--|--|---|---------------------------------|
| <p>Land Use Map would increase the demand for parks and recreation facilities.</p> <p>AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would increase the demand for parks and recreation facilities.</p> | | | | |
| <p>Impact 4.11.8.2 Cumulative Impact on Parks and Recreational Facilities</p> <p>PP Under cumulative conditions, implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would increase the demand for parks and recreation facilities.</p> <p>AA Under cumulative conditions, implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would increase the demand for parks and recreation facilities.</p> <p>AB Under cumulative conditions, implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would increase the demand for parks and recreation facilities.</p> <p>AC Under cumulative conditions,</p> | <p>Policies: 7.A.1, 7.A.2, 7.A.3, 7.A.4, 7.A.5, 7.B.1, 7.B.2, 7.B.3, 7.B.4, 7.B.4, 7.C.1</p> <p>Implementation Programs (Recreation and Trails Section): 1, 2, 3</p> | CS | Implement Mitigation Measure MM 4.11.8.1. | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

*Placer County
May 2003*

*Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report*

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would increase the demand for parks and recreation facilities. | | | | |
| Impact 4.11.9.1 Road Maintenance and Snow Removal PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would require additional roadways within the plan area, thus requiring roadway maintenance and snow removal services. AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley would require additional roadways within the plan area, thus requiring roadway maintenance and snow removal services. AB Implementation of Alternative 1 Land Use Map would require additional roadways within the plan area, thus requiring roadway maintenance and snow removal services. AC Implementation of Alternative 2 Land Use Map would require additional roadways within the plan area, thus requiring roadway maintenance and | None required | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| snow removal services. | | | | |
| Impact 4.11.9.2 Cumulative Road Maintenance and Snow Removal PP Under cumulative conditions, implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would require additional roadways within the plan area, thus requiring roadway maintenance and snow removal services. AA Under cumulative conditions, implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would require additional roadways within the plan area, thus requiring roadway maintenance and snow removal services. AB Under cumulative conditions, implementation of Alternative 1 Land Use Map would require additional roadways within the plan area, thus requiring roadway maintenance and snow removal services. AC Under cumulative conditions, implementation of Alternative 2 Land Use Map would require additional roadways within the plan area, thus requiring roadway maintenance and | None required | LS | None required. | LS |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| snow removal services. | | | | |
| Visual Resources | | | | |
| Impact 4.12.1 Alteration of Views from Highways Outside of the Plan Area PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram would not result in an alteration of views from highways outside of the Plan area. AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would not result in an alteration of views from highways outside of the Plan area. AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would not result in an alteration of views from highways outside of the Plan area. AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map would not result in an alteration of views from highways outside of the Plan area. | Policies: 2.B.1, 2.B.2, 2.B.4, 2.B.5, 2.B.6, 2.B.8, 2.B.9 Implementation Program (Community Design Section): 1 | LS | None required. | LS |
| Impact 4.12.2 Alteration of Public and Private Views PP As viewed from viewpoints in and surrounding the Plan area, implementation of the Proposed Land | Policies: 2.A.1, 2.A.3, 2.A.4, 2.A.5, 2.A.6, 2.A.7, 2.A.8, 2.A.9, 2.B.1, 2.B.2, 2.B.3, 2.B.4, 2.B.5 | S | MM 4.12.2a New hardscape features, such as parking lots and ball courts, and new non-native softscape features, such as golf courses, turf areas, and trails shall be filtered from | SU |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------|
| <p>Use Diagram would substantially alter the existing landscape characteristics in the Plan area and result in impacts to both public and private views.</p> <p>AA As viewed from viewpoints in and surrounding the Plan area, implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map would substantially alter the existing landscape characteristics in the Plan area and result in impacts to both public and private views.</p> <p>AB As viewed from viewpoints in and surrounding the Plan area, implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map would substantially alter the existing landscape characteristics in the Plan area and result in impacts to both public and private views.</p> | <p>2.B.3, 2.B.4, 2.B.5, 2.B.6, 2.B.7, 2.B.8, 2.B.8, 2.B.9, 2.C.1, 2.C.2, 2.C.3, 2.C.4, 2.C.5, 2.C.6, 2.C.7</p> <p>Implementation Programs:</p> <p>(Population and Housing Section): 7 ;</p> <p>(Community Design Section): 1 and 2</p> | | <p>trails, shall be filtered from public views from the open valley, SR 267, and public roadways.</p> <p>MM 4.12.2b All public and private subsequent projects shall be required to submit detailed architectural renderings, site plans, landscaping plans, and visual simulations demonstrating project consistency with the applicable Martis Valley Community Plan policies and other applicable design guidelines, development standards and policies.</p> <p>MM 4.12.2c Plans for fences/walls shall be submitted to the Placer County Planning Department for review during project application processing. Fencing within the Plan area shall follow these guidelines:</p> <p>a. All perimeter fencing shall be open fencing that provides adequate spacing for wildlife</p> | |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------|
| | | | <p>passage, in consultation with California Department of Fish and Game;</p> <p>b. Use of retaining walls shall be limited to the maximum extent possible and shall be screened with native vegetation and/or designed to provide a natural appearance;</p> <p>c. <u>Solid Walls</u> and fences shall not be visible along the open valley, SR 267, or other public roadways.</p> | |
| <p>Impact 4.12.3 Daytime Glare</p> <p>PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram could introduce new sources of daytime glare into the Plan area.</p> <p>AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map could introduce new sources of daytime glare into the Plan area.</p> <p>AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map could introduce new</p> | <p>Policies: 2.A.1, 2.A.2, 2.A.8, 2.B.1, 2.B.2, 2.B.3, 2.B.5, 2.B.9, 2.C.2, 2.C.3</p> <p>Implementation Programs:</p> <p>(Population and Housing Section): 7 ;</p> <p>(Community</p> | S | <p>MM 4.12.3 <u>The conditions of approval for subsequent development projects within the Plan area shall prohibit the use of highly reflective surfaces on the exteriors of structures, except for glass associated with windows and doors, which shall be recessed and/or shaded sufficiently to prevent glare visible from SR 267 and to reduce unnecessary glare from any</u></p> | LS |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------|
| <p>sources of daytime glare into the Plan area.</p> <p>AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map could introduce new sources of daytime glare into the Plan area.</p> | Design Section): 1 and 2 | | <p>other _____ off-site _____ point.</p> <p>Development within the Plan area shall use non-reflective surfaces on the exterior of structures."</p> | |
| <p>Impact 4.12.4 Increase Nighttime Lighting</p> <p>PP Implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram could introduce sources of nighttime light into the Plan area.</p> <p>AA Implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map could introduce sources of nighttime light into the Plan area.</p> <p>AB Implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map could introduce sources of nighttime light into the Plan area.</p> <p>AC Implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map could introduce sources of nighttime light into the Plan area.</p> | <p>Policies: 2.A.1, 2.A.2, 2.A.9, 2.B.5, 2.C.2</p> <p>Implementation Programs:</p> <p>(Population and Housing Section): 7 ;</p> <p>(Community Design Section): 1 and 2</p> | S | <p>MM 4.12.4a Outdoor light fixtures for subsequent non-residential areas (such as commercial and recreation areas) shall be low-intensity, shielded and/or directed away from residential areas and the night sky. All light fixtures shall be limited to 15 feet in height and shall be installed and shielded in such a manner that no light rays are emitted from the fixture at angles above the horizontal plane. High-intensity discharge lamps, such as mercury, metal halide and high-pressure sodium lamps shall be prohibited. Lighting plans shall be provided as part of improvement plans to the County with supporting documentation that adjacent residential areas</p> | SU |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

Placer County
May 2003

Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| | | | <p>will not be adversely affected and that offsite illumination will not exceed 1-foot candles from project sources.</p> <p>MM 4.12.4b Outdoor light fixtures shall be designed to be turned off when not in use where security and safety is not a concern. This requirement shall be included in lighting plans submitted to the County as part of improvement plans.</p> <p>MM 4.12.4c Street light fixtures shall be restricted to roadway intersections and shall be installed and shielded in such a manner that no light rays are emitted from the fixture at angles above the horizontal plane. High-intensity discharge lamps, such as mercury, metal halide and high-pressure sodium lamps shall be prohibited. Offsite illumination shall not exceed 1-foot candles due to lighting</p> | |

S - Significant
PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|--------|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| | | | <p>sources.</p> <p>MM 4.12.4d The County shall require that subsequent residential project design guidelines and/or project CC&Rs shall restrict residences from utilizing flood and/or spot lighting fixtures. All resident light fixtures shall use low-pressure sodium lamps or other similar lighting fixture and shall be shielded away from adjoining residents and the night sky.</p> <p>MM 4.12.4e Nighttime lighting shall not be allowed for golf course driving ranges, sports fields, and ski terrain.</p> <p>MM 4.12.4f Project design guidelines and/or project CC&Rs shall be submitted by each project applicant to the Placer County Planning Department for review and approval to verify that the lighting standards are in place.</p> <p>Responsible</p> | |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| | | | Agency/Department: Planning Department Time frame: Ongoing Funding: Permit fees | |
| Impact 4.12.5 Cumulative Visual Impacts PP Under cumulative conditions, implementation of the Proposed Land Use Diagram could result in visual impacts, including alteration of viewsheds, increased daytime glare and nighttime lighting. AA Under cumulative conditions, implementation of the Existing Martis Valley General Plan Land Use Map could result in visual impacts, including alteration of viewsheds, increased daytime glare and nighttime lighting. AB Under cumulative conditions, implementation of the Alternative 1 Land Use Map could result in visual impacts, including alteration of viewsheds, increased daytime glare and nighttime lighting. AC Under cumulative conditions, implementation of the Alternative 2 Land Use Map could result in visual | Policies: 2.A.1, 2.A.2, 2.A.3, 2.A.4, 2.A.5, 2.A.6, 2.A.7, 2.A.8, 2.A.8, 2.A.9, 2.B.1, 2.B.2, 2.B.3, 2.B.4, 2.B.5, 2.B.6, 2.B.7, 2.B.8, 2.B.9, 2.C.1, 2.C.2, 2.C.3, 2.C.4, 2.C.5, 2.C.6, 2.C.8 Implementation Program: (Population and Housing Section): 7 ; (Community Design Section): 1 and 2 | CS | Implement Mitigation Measures MM 4.12.2a through c, MM 4.12.3, and MM 4.12.4a through f. | SU |

S - Significant

PS=Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant

CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable

B - Beneficial

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact | Mitigation Policies and Implementation Programs | Level of Significance Without Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance |
|---|---|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| impacts, including alteration of viewsheds, increased daytime glare and nighttime lighting. | | | | |

S - Significant
PS-Potentially Significant

LS - Less Than Significant
CS - Cumulative Significant

SU - Significant and Unavoidable
B - Beneficial

*Placer County
May 2003*

*Martis Valley Community Plan Update
Final Environmental Impact Report*